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ABSTRACT
The early sixteenth century was a period of intense experimentation in Dutch history writing. The little-known author Jan van Naaldwijk, whose two Dutch chronicles of Holland are preserved in autograph manuscripts in the British Library, participated in these developments. An amateur writer, but – importantly – an expert reader, Jan compiled chronicles which, while rooted in the historical tradition of Holland, nevertheless expanded it in ways that, for all their idiosyncrasy, can help us to appreciate the broader impact of innovations occurring at the same time in more ‘professional’ scholarly circles. This dissertation is the first in-depth study of his chronicles.

Chapter 1 contains a critical appraisal of late medieval chronicles of Holland, focusing in particular on Jan Beke’s Latin Chronographia (c. 1346) and its Dutch translation, which laid the foundation for later historiographical discussions and experiments, including those of the first decades of the sixteenth century.

Chapter 2 describes how, in 1514, Jan van Naaldwijk produced a chronicle of Holland, based on traditional historical writing about the county, but extending it in new directions and drawing on over twenty sources, in Dutch, Latin and French, in both manuscript and print.

In 1517, what was to become the most influential vernacular chronicle of Holland, the so-called Divisiekroniek, was printed. Chapter 3 examines how Jan responded to its publication by making it the main source for a supplement to his first chronicle. His use of the Divisiekroniek shows that contemporaries perceived the work differently from modern scholars.

The rise of humanist and antiquarian studies of the Dutch past from the early sixteenth century onwards did not end the medieval chronicle tradition of Holland. Chapter 4 explores its continuing existence in the later sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, side-by-side with new approaches to writing history.

The Documentary Appendix presents transcriptions of both Jan’s chronicles.
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EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES
Throughout this dissertation, I have preserved the orthography found in the primary sources, both manuscript and printed, which I have cited. I have, however, expanded abbreviations; and the most obvious errors have been silently corrected. In citing Latin titles, I have normalized the letters ‘u’ and ‘v’, ‘y’ and ‘i’, according to modern conventions. A full bibliographical reference is given the first time a work is cited in each chapter, with a short reference for further citations within that chapter. The prepositions ‘van’ and ‘te’ and the article ‘de’ in Modern Dutch names are ignored for the purposes of alphabetization, as are articles at the beginning of titles. All translations are my own unless otherwise indicated.

I avoid the term ‘the Netherlands’ on the grounds that it is anachronistic and confusing before the Dutch Revolt. Instead, I use ‘Low Countries’ throughout for the coastal regions of the Rhine, Scheldt and Meuse delta – roughly, but not exactly, corresponding to present day Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg, including parts of northern France (Maps 1 and 2). It is not meant to refer to a precisely defined geographical or political region. The word ‘Holland’ is used for the medieval county of Holland; ‘Dutch’ is employed exclusively in a linguistic sense, to indicate the collection of dialects of the Germanic language spoken throughout this region.
Map 1: Dioceses before 1557

Map 2: The Burgundian Low Countries, 1384-1536

Jan van Naaldwijk and his Chronicles of Holland

Jan van Naaldwijk was the son of a Dutch nobleman. Between 1513 and c. 1520 he wrote two unpublished Dutch prose chronicles of Holland. In his first chronicle, he lamented that he had not been able to gain access to the most recent scholarship concerning the history of Holland. Therefore, he based his work on the Dutch version of Jan Beke’s chronicle of Holland and Utrecht, the principal source for the history of the region. In addition, he claimed to have used more than thirty different additional sources. Shortly after he completed this text, a large vernacular chronicle of Holland, which later became known as the *Divisiekröniek* (‘Division Chronicle’), was published. Recognizing that this new work presented a different perspective on the history of Holland, he decided to supplement his first chronicle with a second one, largely an abridgement of the *Divisiekröniek*, but with some additional material from other sources. Jan van Naaldwijk’s two chronicles of Holland are preserved only in their autograph manuscripts: London, British Library, MSS Cotton Vitellius F xv and Cotton Tiberius C iv. There is no indication that he intended to publish either chronicle.

The two manuscripts came into the possession of Sir Robert Cotton via his friend Emanuel van Meteren (Demetrius, Meteranus), merchant and historian, son of an Antwerp trader who had been the financier of one of the earliest English printed bibles. Van Meteren was the commercial consul for the Netherlands in London and also the author of a history of the Dutch Revolt.¹ There are a significant number of Dutch historical manuscripts in the Cotton collection, some of which have been identified as

having been brought to England by van Meteren’s efforts; and my investigation of the manuscripts of Jan van Naaldwijk’s chronicles has shown that they, too, passed through his hands: marginal notes in both manuscripts can be identified as written by him. While van Meteren was actively on the lookout for manuscripts for Cotton whenever he was in the Low Countries, and probably brought them over as a lucrative business enterprise, these two manuscripts came to him by a unique route: from a seventeenth-century genealogy, we learn that Jan’s daughter, ‘Miss Barbara van Naaldwijk, married Sir van Kuyck, lord of Meteren.’ The coincidence suggests that the manuscripts passed from Jan to his daughter Barbara, eventually reaching Emanuel van Meteren through family connections. They would have been acquired by Cotton in 1612 at the latest, on van Meteren’s death. In the early 1620s they were recorded, side by side and together with another manuscript coming from van Meteren, in the earliest catalogue of the Cotton collection; lists of their contents were added on the verso sides of their cover leaves at this time. In the list of contents, the second chronicle, which breaks off mid-sentence in 1461, was described by van Meteren as ‘finishing anno 1461’; the first, which ends in 1514, was mistakenly identified by him as ending in 1414. These indications led later historians to misdate both texts, assuming that they were written in the fifteenth century.

Once they had entered the Cotton library, Jan’s chronicles led a dormant existence until the 1760s, when the first printed notice of the manuscripts was published by Jean Paquot, whose account of the texts was faulty in almost every detail. He claimed that the manuscript of the first chronicle (Vitellius F xv) ended in 1363 (as mentioned above, it ends in 1514). Believing the second chronicle to be written ‘anno 1461’, he misidentified

---

2 London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C xi, one of the most important early historiographical collections from Holland, is known to have been supplied by van Meteren, as was MS Cotton Vespasianus D ix, art. 10, a copy of the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’: Tite, Early Records, p. 14.

3 See below, Chapter 4, pp. 217-218, 241-244. Cf. esp. Verduyn, Emanuel van Meteren, plate xxvi on p. 230.

4 British Library, MS Cotton Julius C iii, fols 138r-142r, letters by van Meteren to Sir Robert Cotton.


6 London, British Library, MS Harley 6018: nos 157 (Tiberius C iv) and 158 (Vitellius F xv); no. 156 (MS Cotton Tiberius C xi) is another van Meteren manuscript.

7 Such tables were usually added during Sir Robert’s life: Tite, Early Records, fig. 4b, p. 21, and p. 15, n. 89.

8 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, cover leaf: ‘Historie ofte cronycke van Hollant ende Zeelant, daer den authuer in seijt een vermeerderinge te sijn van syn eerste cronyjcke al bescreuen bij Johan van Naeldwijk edelman van Hollant eijndende anno 1461’.

9 London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 1r: ‘Cronijcke van Hollandt van Jan van Naeldwijk totten jare 1414’.
the author as an older homonymous second cousin of Jan’s who died in 1489; and he erroneously claimed that the two chronicles together were the same as the work published under the title ‘Chronicle of Gouda’. This last statement in particular has been the cause of much confusion in the following two and a half centuries.

In the mid-nineteenth century, Laurens van den Bergh subjected Jan’s chronicles to renewed examination and found that they were not the same as the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, but instead a hitherto unknown work. He described the two texts as ‘a chronicle, written in the vernacular, with an accompanying continuation’. Copying from the description on the cover leaf of the manuscript, he stated that the first chronicle ended in 1414 (an improvement on Paquot’s 1363, but still a century off), and that the second chronicle constituted a continuation to 1461 (in reality, it is not a continuation, but a supplementary chronicle, which stops abruptly, unfinished and incomplete, in this year). Assessing the merits of the texts, van den Bergh cautiously concluded that an edition might be useful for the study of the history of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Three decades later, however, Samuel Muller Fz. published an article in which he warned others against investing any more energy in studying the chronicles. He established that the two manuscripts did not comprise a chronicle and its continuation, but rather ‘two chronicles, or rather two versions of the same chronicle’. Moreover, he

---

10 J. N. Paquot, *Memoires pour servir à l’histoire littéraire des dix-sept Provinces des Pays-Bas, de la principauté de Liége, et de quelques contrées voisines*, 18 vols (Leuven, 1763-70), IX, pp. 99-100; the manuscript must have been in a very poor state, and its quires may have been gathered incorrectly when Paquot consulted it, though the current binding reveals no irregularity around fol. 178, which contains events of 1363.

11 Up to the present day, the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ is advertised by antiquarian booksellers as probably written by Jan van Naaldwijk. I have not been able to trace the basis for the unlikely attribution of editions of the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’ to Jan van Naaldwijk, found not only in Google Books, but also in the supposedly more reputable Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren Basisbibliotheek (http://www.dbnl.org/basisbibliotheek/). For Jan’s use of the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’, see below, Chapter 2, pp. 92-93.


14 Ibid., p. 120.

15 Ibid., p. 121.


17 Ibid., p. 393: ‘twee kronieken, of liever twee bewerkingen van dezelfde kroniek’.
made clear that the author was not the mid-fifteenth century Jan van Naaldwijk identified by Paquot, even expressing doubt as to whether he had belonged to the same aristocratic family (reading the first chronicle would have cured him of this scepticism).\(^\text{18}\) He dated the first chronicle to 1514 or shortly after. Muller assumed, but did not verify, that in this work Jan had followed his main source, the Dutch version of the chronicle of Jan Beke, verbatim, only occasionally adding material from Latin and French sources.\(^\text{19}\) As for the second chronicle, he concluded, on the basis of a comparison, that it was ‘merely a compilation from, or worse, a copy’ of the *Divisiekroniek* of 1517.\(^\text{20}\) He believed that Jan van Naaldwijk had been unlucky – his attempt to find a publisher for his first chronicle had been thwarted by the publication of the much superior *Divisiekroniek*, making his work redundant. Jan’s attempt to write a second chronicle, derived from the *Divisiekroniek*, was evidence of a profound lack of judgement. In Muller’s opinion, after his study of the manuscripts and his edition of the introductions, there was no need for further research.\(^\text{21}\)

our author does not deserve any great effort. And this would be necessary: the opportunity to have the manuscript investigated by an authority on our medieval history is lacking while it is in London. I cannot recommend anyone to make the journey for this reason. The only possibility would be to produce an anthology of everything he reports about Naaldwijk, Loosduinen and the region in his first version: perhaps we shall find some pieces of information among the village gossip.\(^\text{22}\)

Not surprisingly, a long period of neglect followed Muller’s indictment, interrupted from time to time by short notices in bibliographies (generally drawing on the earlier descriptions)\(^\text{23}\) and by publications on the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, still occasionally

\(^{18}\) Ibid., but the author himself traces his ancestry: MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 149v.

\(^{19}\) Muller Fz., ‘De kronieken’, p. 394.

\(^{20}\) Ibid., p. 396: ‘slechts eene compilatie, erger nog, eene kopie’.

\(^{21}\) Some later scholars have taken him on his word: thus, the passage about Jan van Naaldwijk in J. A. L. Lancée, *Erasmus en het Hollands humanisme* (Utrecht, 1979), pp. 92-6, is best ignored, as it is based exclusively on a faulty reading of Muller’s article, and riddled with additional errors.

\(^{22}\) Muller, ‘De kronieken’, pp. 399-400: ‘Doch onze schrijver verdient niet, dat men veel moeite om hem doe. En dit zou nodig zijn: de gelegenheid om het handschrift door een grondigen kenner onzer middeleeuwsche geschiedenis te doen onderzoeken, ontbreekt zolang het te Londen is. Ik kan niemand aanraden, daarvoor de reis te doen. Het eenige, dat mogelijk ware, zou zijn eene bloemlezing te doen vervaardigen van al hetgene hij in zijne eerste redactie over Naaldwijk, Loosduinen en den omtrek mededeelt: wellicht komen ons onder de dorpspraatjes nog wetenswaardige zaken onder de oogen.’

attributed to Jan van Naaldwijk,\footnote{S. Muller Fz., *Lijst van Noord-Nederlandse kronijken: met opgave van bestaande handschriften en litteratuur* (Utrecht, 1880), pp. 15-16 (where Muller erroneously claims that Jan was the continuator and printer of the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’), 23-4; K. de Flou and E. Gailliard, *Beschrijving van Middelnederlandse en andere handschriften die in Engeland bewaard worden*, 3 vols (Ghent, 1895-7), III, pp. 103-11; U. J. Chevalier, *Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge ... Bio-Bibliographie*, 2 vols (Paris, 1877-86), II, col. 2451.} though elsewhere his authorship was explicitly dismissed.\footnote{Romein, *Geschiedenis*, pp. 107; *Narrative Sources*, no. NL0177.}

In recent decades, however, the chronicles have received renewed attention from scholars in the Netherlands. In the course of her research into the sources and context of the *Divisiekroniek*, Karin Tilmans of the University of Amsterdam acquired microfilms of the two manuscripts, which she shared with colleagues, thereby increasing the accessibility of Jan’s chronicles to Dutch scholars.\footnote{M. J. van Gent, ‘*Pertijelike saken’: Hoeken en Kabeljauwen in het Bourgondisch-Oostenrijkse tijdperk* (The Hague, 1994), p. 21, n. 65, refers to his use of Tilmans’s microfilm.} Tilmans herself erroneously identified Jan’s first chronicle as a source for the *Divisiekroniek*;\footnote{K. Tilmans, *De Divisiekroniek van 1517. Uitgave van het Bourgondische-Habsburgse deel (divisie 29-32)* (Amsterdam, 2003), pp. 23-36; K. Tilmans, *Historiography and Humanism in Holland in the Age of Erasmus: Aurelius and the Divisiekroniek of 1517* (Nieuwkoop, 1992), p. 193. Cf. below, Chapter 3, n. 741.} and on several occasions she has referred to the relationship between the production of Jan’s two chronicles and the publication of the *Divisiekroniek*.\footnote{Tilmans, *Historiography*, pp. 3-4, 80; K. Tilmans, ‘De Hollandse kroniek van Willem Hermans ontdekt. Een Egmondse codex uit ca. 1514’, in G. N. M. Vis, M. Mostert and P. J. Margry (eds), *Heiligenleven, annalen en kroniekten. Geschiedschrijving in middeleeuws Egmond* (Hilversum, 1990), pp. 169-91, at 173-4.} In 1987, Bunna Ebels-Hoving noted that the chronicles deserve further study;\footnote{B. Ebels-Hoving, ‘*Nederlandse geschiedschrijving 1350-1530. Een poging tot karakterisering*’, in B. Ebels-Hoving, C. G. Santing and K. Tilmans (eds), *Genoegchliche ende lustige historiën. Laatmiddeleeuwse geschiedschrijving in Nederland* (Hilversum, 1987), pp. 217-42, at 232, n. 64.} but, until now, this call has not been answered.\footnote{An MA thesis about Jan’s first chronicle was written after I began work on this dissertation: W.-J. Storm, ‘De Cronijck van Holland van Jan van Naaldwijk’, MA thesis, Universiteit Leiden, 2007.}

In recent years, some interest has been shown in the chronicles as a source of historical data. Michel van Gent, Livia Visser-Fuchs and Willem den Hertog have made efforts to locate certain of Muller’s ‘pieces of information among the village gossip’ in Jan’s first chronicle. Van Gent drew on it for his history of political strife in fifteenth-century Holland;\footnote{Gent, ‘*Pertijelike saken*’; M. J. van Gent, ‘Een middeleeuwse crisismanager: Joost van Lalaing, stadhouder van Holland en Zeeland, 1480-1483’, *Liber amicorum Raphaël de Smidt*, III: *Historia* (Leuven, 2001), pp. 165-81.} Visser-Fuchs employed material from it for her account of the exile of King...
Edward IV of England in 1470-71;\textsuperscript{32} and den Hertog made extensive use of it for his history of the abbey of Loosduinen,\textsuperscript{33} to which he appended a biographical account of Jan, based on the information provided in the chronicle. Supplemented by the will of Sir Hendrik van Naaldwijk, Jan’s guardian after the death of his father Sir Adriaan van Naaldwijk, the chronicle showed that Jan was indeed a descendant of the aristocratic Naaldwijk family.\textsuperscript{34} Finally, Jan Bondeson consulted the manuscripts for his research on the miracle of Countess Margaret of Hennenberg’s 365 children.\textsuperscript{35}

This dissertation presents the first in-depth study of the two chronicles of Holland written by Jan van Naaldwijk. It is a study of historiography, aiming to understand how an early sixteenth-century author set out to write about the history of Holland. To achieve this, I have explored a number of questions. Which sources did he use? What reasons did he have for his choice of sources? How did he shape the material at his disposal into a new history? By answering these questions, I have attempted to establish the place of Jan van Naaldwijk’s chronicles in the tradition of historical writing about Holland.

The wider goal of this study is to examine the continuities and transitions within that tradition in the early sixteenth century. What do Jan’s writings tell us about contemporary reactions to developments which have been identified as significant in the culture of the period, particularly the printing press and humanism, and about their relation to continuing medieval cultural currents? It has been necessary, therefore, to look not only at Jan’s chronicles themselves, but also at the broader historical context, examining what came before and after.

In Chapter 1 I investigate the rise of historical writing about Holland from the middle of the fourteenth century up to the point at which Jan encountered it in the early sixteenth

\textsuperscript{32} L. Visser-Fuchs, “‘Il n’a plus lion ne lieppart, qui voeullle tenir de sa part’: Edward IV in Exile, October 1470 to March 1471’, in J.-M. Cauchies (ed.), \textit{L’Angleterre et les pays bourguignons: relations et comparaisons (Xve-XVIe s.)} (Neuchâtel, 1995), pp. 91-106, at 98-100. She erroneously ascribes (p. 98, n. 25) the location ‘Cotton Vitellius B xv’ to the manuscript of Jan’s first chronicle, and claims that ‘there is no printed edition because the Divisie-kroniek used van Naaldwijk’s text.’ See further below, Chapter 3, nn. 741 and 768.

\textsuperscript{33} W. E. den Hertog, \textit{De abdij van Loosduinen. Cisterciënzerinnenklooster van 1229-1572} (The Hague, 1997).

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid., pp. 439-43. Den Hertog argues that he was possibly Adriaan’s illegitimate son. However, most of Jan’s biography is conjectural, and this as well as other claims, such as that made by Tilmans, \textit{Historiography}, p. 89, that Jan was ‘a priest in Loosduinen’, are unsupported by evidence, in spite of Jan’s apparent ties to Loosduinen, for which see below, Chapter 2, pp. 126-129. Tilmans possibly based the assumption on the unreliable Lancée, \textit{Erasmus}, at p. 92 (see above, n. 21).

\textsuperscript{35} On which see below, Chapter 2, pp. 126-129. J. Bondeson, \textit{The Two-Headed Boy, and Other Medical Marvels} (Ithaca, NY, etc., 2000), pp. 70-71, 289.
century. Chapter 2 is a detailed study of Jan’s first chronicle, his use of sources and his composition of a new history which drew on the tradition outlined in the first chapter. Chapter 3 shows how he responded to the publication of the most significant chronicle of Holland to appear in his lifetime. Chapter 4 traces the further development and dissemination of the medieval historical tradition of Holland in the early modern period.
Chapter 1

‘Wt voel boecken ende autoeren’

‘From many books and authors’
– The Historiographical Tradition of Holland before Jan van Naaldwijk

Fig. 1: Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS BPL 2429, fol. 1r: Jan Beke, Chronographia, manuscript c. 1360

Image from Universiteit Leiden, Digital Special Collections (soocrates.leidenuniv.nl).
APPROACHES TO PRE-MODERN HISTORICAL TEXTS

In the introduction to his first chronicle of Holland, Jan van Naaldwijk made it clear that his work was part of an ongoing historiographical tradition and mentality:

I, Jan van Naaldwijk, aspired to write this chronicle of Holland according to my rough intellect, to be corrected by those who are more knowledgeable. I compiled, collected, translated and adapted into Dutch this history, gest and chronicle from many French and Latin books and authors.36

The historiographical context Jan imagined for his work was formed, on the one hand, by the written texts which served as the sources for his history and, on the other, by the historical knowledge and consciousness of readers of such works, to whom he appealed with his request for the correction of his chronicle. This request, however, was a standard modesty trope, which is further weakened by the fact that Jan gives no indication anywhere in his chronicle of the readership he imagined for the work. That he thought of his chronicle and its context primarily in textual terms is confirmed by the impressive list of words he uses to describe his activity as an historian: he ‘compiled, collected, translated and adapted’ his sources into a new product, for which he also had three different words: a history, a gest, a chronicle.

In modern scholarship, medieval historical writings are categorized on a generic scale ranging from annals to chronicles to histories, that is, from those presenting the most succinct enumeration of facts in chronological order to more sophisticated analytical works. The distinction between the different genres is not entirely without precedent in medieval theories;37 but, as Jan’s characterization of his own work attests, the applicability of established generic categories is limited, and allowance should be made for additional terms such as Jan’s ‘ijeste’, gest, presumably to be understood as a true account of the deeds of important men.38 Moreover, even when medieval authors were conscious of the differences between annals, chronicles and histories, this awareness

---

36 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r: ‘Doe heb je jan van naeldwick voer mij ghenomen dese cronijck van hollant te willen maken na mijn arm rudelic verstant ende tot correxien der gheenre dijet beter weten ende heb dese historie ijeste ende cronijck genomen vergadert ende ghetranslateert ende ouergheset wt den walschen ende latijnen in duijtsche wt voel boecken ende autoeren’.


never led them to exclude one genre in favour of another when selecting sources for their own works. Furthermore, the identification of texts as histories was not always the main factor in classifying them: only from the late fourteenth century did histories start to be grouped together in library collections.  

The fluidity of the terms Jan used when describing his activity as an historian – partly distinct, partly overlapping – highlights the problem of approaching medieval texts through a rigid system of classification. Modern analytical notions such as ‘genre’ often fail to account for the flexibility of medieval literary practice and can invite anachronistic misinterpretations of medieval texts.

Perhaps most significantly, the four terms used by Jan to describe his activity as an historian – compile, collect, translate and adapt – each denote a process which entails deriving material from other works. While the disclaimer of originality is certainly a common topos in the Middle Ages, it is entirely appropriate to much of medieval historical writing and, especially, to chronicles. In the medieval chronicle, the activity of historiography most clearly overlaps with that of compilatio: unlike the commentator, a compiler was not expected to add expositional matter to his sources; but, unlike the scribe, he was ‘free to rearrange’.

Approaching the medieval chronicler as a compiler does not mean that we should consider him to have been, as has been argued, ‘a slave to his documents’; such an approach denies the potentially creative nature of the process of selection and reorganization. Those approaches to medieval historiography are more fruitful which do not presuppose categories, but instead trace in detail the process of change over time in


40 Consider, for example, the received opinion that Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *Historia regum Britannie* is fiction, not history, which ignores the fact that medieval readers approached the work as a history: S. Leve, ‘Wurzeln und Zweige: die Prophetien Merlins und einige Vorschläge zur Lektüre mittelalterlicher Geschichtsschreibung’, in K. Brodersen (ed.), *Prognosis: Studien zur Funktion von Zukunftsvorhersagen in Literatur und Geschichte seit der Antike* (Münster, 2001), pp. 97-120, 129-41. While P. Strohm, ‘Storie, Spelle, Geste, Romanaunce, Tragedie: Generic Distinctions in the Middle English Troy Narratives’, *Speculum* 46 (1971), pp. 348-59, is correct in warning against the false friends in medieval nomenclature and modern theoretical terminology, I am not certain whether ‘mediaeval terms would assist modern critics in their quest for a sympathetic response to works written in other places, other times’ (ibid., p. 359), unless one incorporates the flexibility and fluidity of medieval – or any other historical – practice into the analysis, as does R. L. Colie, *The Resources of Kind: Genre-Theory in the Renaissance* (Berkeley, etc., 1973).


the transmission of texts, as it affects their narratives, ideologies and structures.43 Such approaches have the benefit of being able to account for the cross-pollination of texts from different genres, different institutional settings, different languages, different ages and different moments and locations of reception, following the lines of transmission pertinent to the historical context of each work.44 The ability of these approaches to explain influence which runs counter to chronology is perhaps most relevant to the study of the impact of Renaissance humanism on historical thinking, where ancient texts were used to reinterpret or supplant later (medieval) traditions; but they also help to describe the medieval practice of revision of older texts on the basis of newer ones.45

Approaches that attempt to trace textual traditions over time can explain, above all, the precise significance of alterations and variations in the transmission of narratives, ideas and texts. Although it is the received wisdom that medieval chronicles, in particular, are repositories of material transmitted almost mindlessly,46 this view is unsatisfactory not only because it fails to account for the continuous repetition of this supposedly mindless activity throughout the ages, but more importantly because it ignores the fact that, especially in manuscript culture, no two versions of any text were identical and that the space between copies and versions (and different texts, for that matter) was a grey area


44 The concept of ‘meme’ can be a useful tool in the study of historiographical traditions. It is fruitfully applied to the study of medieval and Renaissance romance by H. Cooper, The English Romance in Time: Transforming Motifs from Geoffrey of Monmouth to the Death of Shakespeare (Oxford, 2004), who defines the concept as ‘an idea that behaves like a gene in its ability to replicate faithfully and abundantly, but also on occasion to adapt, mutate, and therefore survive in different forms and cultures’ (p. 3).

45 A case in point is the revision Henry of Huntingdon made to his own Historia Anglorum, which was based on Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum, after his ‘discovery’ of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia regum Britanniae (Henry of Huntingdon, Historia Anglorum, ed. and transl. D. Greenway (Oxford, 1996), pp. lxxii, 558-83), which itself used an earlier version of Henry’s Historia (ibid., p. 60, n. 176); Levelt, ‘Wurzeln’.

where medieval scribes, compilers and authors exercised considerable creativity. Small changes can make a big difference, and the accumulation of many small changes can create a new historiography.

**Histories of Medieval History Writing in the Low Countries**

Nineteenth-century literary historians in Belgium and the Netherlands, like their counterparts throughout Europe, showed little interest in historical texts as literature. The early histories of Dutch literature are narrowly concerned with texts written in Dutch verse, and primarily those originally composed in Dutch, with an emphasis on their aesthetic value. Prose works were virtually ignored because, in the words of the discipline’s founder, Willem Jonckbloet, they ‘do not belong to the realm of Art’. Latin and French texts also for the most part fell outside the scope of Dutch literary history. In encyclopaedic histories of Dutch literature, the most significant historical texts were mentioned; yet even in more recent reference works they are still often explicitly located in ‘the fringe of literature’, and up to the present day how that fringe is related to its

---

47 The assumption can also lead to an inappropriate negation of the meaning conveyed by a text, based on conjectures about its genesis. Thus, e.g., noting apparent political bias in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, A. Janse, ‘De gelaagdheid van een middeleeuwse kroniek. De ontstaansgeschiedenis van het zogenaamde Goudse kroniekje’, *Queeste. Tijdschrift over middeleeuwsse letterkunde* 8 (2001), pp. 134-59, at 156, writes: ‘Het is mogelijk dat zijn bron hiervoor verantwoordelijk is’, thereby erroneously implying that if indeed the source could be held responsible, the author and his text would be absolved of partiality.

48 This point appears to be slowly catching on. It has recently been made, e.g., by R. McKitterick, *Perceptions of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, IN, 2006), p. 4.

49 Even nowadays many still do not; consider, e.g., R. M. Stein, ‘Literary Criticism and the Evidence for History’, in N. Partner (ed.), *Writing Medieval History* (London, 2005), pp. 67-87, at 72, who asks, without a hint of irony: ‘What are the precise grounds by which we accept a part of an ancient narrative as providing a clear window onto the past and dismiss the rest?”


51 Consider, ibid., pp. 7-9, where te Winkel criticizes Jonckbloet’s ‘critical-aesthetic’ (‘critisch-aestetisch’) approach, but argues any literary history should be ‘historical-aesthetic’ (‘historisch-aestetisch’).


53 Ibid., I, p. 3: ‘De Nederlandsche Letterkunde bestaat natuurlijk uit werken, geschreven in de Nederlandsche taal’.

The presumed centre has never properly been examined. The study of medieval literature and the study of medieval historiography were, and largely remain, distinct disciplines.

Dutch scholars who did take an interest in medieval historical texts, again similar to elsewhere in Europe, generally did so with a strictly historical focus. The first extensive survey of Dutch historical writers was produced in the 1830s; but it merely listed the sources, presenting no analysis and ignoring the connections between them. Samuel Muller Fz.’s list of chronicles of the northern Low Countries, published in 1880, was somewhat more comprehensive and analytical. Medieval historical sources of the northern Low Countries, in particular, however, remained to a significant extent inaccessible, since there was no Dutch equivalent to national editions such as the Monumenta Germaniae Historica or the ‘Rolls Series’ in Britain. The medieval Dutch historical tradition – like, perhaps, medieval Dutch literature in general – was regarded as devoid of interest: ‘grey and paralysed like an overcast November day in the flat country where it came into being and where no summit, not even a turn of the road offers unexpected vistas’.

Johan Huizinga’s definition of history as ‘the intellectual form in which a culture renders account to itself of its past’ provided his former student Jan Romein with a new impetus and a new perspective for analysing the history of historiography in the northern

---

55 The most recent history of medieval Dutch literature, F. van Oostrom, Stemmen op schrift: geschiedenis van de Nederlandse literatuur vanaf het begin tot 1300 (Amsterdam, 2006), which goes up to 1300, is no exception, all but ignoring the Latin historical tradition in the Low Countries.

56 One notable exception is the admirable attempt to bridge the divide by A. L. H. Hage, Sonder favele, sonder lieghen. Onderzoek naar vorm en functie van de Middelnederlandse rijmkroniek als historiografisch genre (Groningen, 1989).

57 For an excellent survey of modern scholarship on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century historiography, a field in which, by contrast, scholars have from early on shown an interest in the literary nature of historiography, see S. Langereis, Geschiedenis als ambacht. Oudheidkunde in de Gouden Eeuw: Arnoldus Buchelius en Petrus Scriverius (Hilversum, 2001), pp. 9-23.


59 Muller, Lijst. A first investigation of the sources and the stages of transmission of the late medieval chronicle tradition of Holland had in the meanwhile been published by J. Bolhuis van Zeeburgh, ‘Hollandsche geschiedbronnen voor het Beiersche tijdperk, 1345–1436’, Bijdragen voor vaderlandsche geschiedenis en oudheidkunde, nieuwe reeks, 8 (1875), pp. 347-76.

60 Romein, Geschiedenis, pp. xix-xx: ‘grauw en vleugellam ... als een druïligen Novemberdag in het vlakke land waar zij ontstond en waar geen bergtop, zelfs geen kromming in de weg onverwachte vergezichten biedt’. More than half a century later, the sentiment was reiterated as a communis opinio by Lettinck, ‘Character’, p. 321.

Low Countries. Yet, in spite of his stated aim of writing a survey of the materials from which medieval culture could be investigated, Romein often failed to escape the precepts of the traditional approaches to historical texts, showing little genuine interest in his sources unless they had obvious literary (i.e., aesthetic) or historical (i.e., factual) merit. Consequently, he remained more intent on the descriptive information provided by those individual sources which contained scraps of data useful for cultural history than on the source per se as a product of medieval culture. He categorized his sources according to literary ‘circles’; but, as he himself acknowledged, these ‘circles’ were largely imaginary and did not necessarily correspond to the institutional contexts in which the texts were produced. Had Romein taken his own approach to its logical conclusion, he would have recognized that if Dutch historiography was especially uninteresting, this was all the more reason to investigate it as a product of a specific culture.

In 1932, however, Romein’s account of the medieval historiography of the northern Low Countries was groundbreaking, and to this day it has not been superseded. The study of medieval Dutch historiographical works was given another new impetus in the early 1980s by the appearance of two works: Marijke Carasso-Kok’s *Repertorium*, which provided an extensive bibliography of medieval historical narrative sources, both published and unpublished, from the northern Low Countries; and Bernard Guenée’s *Histoire et culture historique dans l’Occident médiéval*, which presented a new methodological framework in which to study medieval historiography in general.

A flurry of renewed interest in Dutch historical sources ensued over the next twenty-odd years, mainly expressed in monographs on individual sources and authors, along with studies and editions of some very important and some rather obscure texts.

---

63 A similar point is made by Lettinck, ‘Character’, p. 321, who argues that the traditional negative assessment of medieval Dutch historiography is the result of misplaced expectations.
64 Carasso-Kok, *Repertorium*. This work is now superseded by the online database *Narrative Sources*, which covers both the northern and the southern Dutch Low Countries.
65 Guenée, *Histoire*.
Nonetheless, while far more works are now accessible in modern editions, many – including some of the most significant ones – remain unpublished.\textsuperscript{68} A thorough study of Dutch historiographical traditions in the Middle Ages, replacing Romein’s work, is still a desideratum. To date, the most detailed analysis remains Bunna Ebels-Hoving’s 26-page article, now two decades old, ‘Dutch Historical Writing 1350-1530: An Attempt at Characterization’,\textsuperscript{69} which, while significantly more ambitious in scope than its modest title might suggest, does not constitute an equivalent for the Dutch Low Countries of seminal studies such as Antonia Gransden’s \textit{Historical Writing in England}.\textsuperscript{70} Nor are there many monographs covering specific periods or themes in Dutch history writing comparable to Gabrielle Spiegel’s \textit{Romancing the Past} or Eric Cochrane’s \textit{Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance}.\textsuperscript{71} Every generation since Jonckbloet’s foundational work in the 1850s has produced its own survey of medieval Dutch literary traditions; by contrast, a more or less complete study of the history of medieval Dutch historiography has been attempted only once.\textsuperscript{72}

Furthermore, even when scholars started to look for more than merely ‘historical facts’ in medieval chronicles, only those considered to be of particular significance were seriously studied – and a late medieval chronicle’s significance was generally measured either by its novelty value or by the extent to which it could be regarded as a forerunner of the Dutch Golden Age: the first chronicle to be printed, the first to be written under the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{68} E.g., the chronicles of Claes Heynenzoon, most of the writings of Dirk Frankenszoon Pauw, several works of Johannes a Leydis, along with the great majority of anonymous and early printed chronicles. Many other texts are available only in seventeenth- or eighteenth-century editions of varying reliability.


\textsuperscript{71} G. Spiegel, \textit{Romancing the Past. The Rise of Vernacular Prose Historiography in Thirteenth-Century France} (Berkeley, etc., 1993); E. Cochrane, \textit{Historians and Historiography in the Italian Renaissance} (Chicago, etc., 1981). The most significant exception is Hage, \textit{Sonder favele}; his corpus, however, is limited to just five texts.

\textsuperscript{72} Romein, \textit{Geschiedenis}, which covers only published sources from the northern Low Countries.
\end{footnotesize}
influence of humanism and so on. 73 Even as recently as 2007, an academic publication could berate other scholars for having over-emphasized the ‘new’ in the chronicles which they studied, while characterizing the chronicle of its primary interest as ‘an important turning point’, ‘a highly innovative text’. 74

Yet, characteristics which in the past have been considered typically humanist – such as a critical approach to sources, an interest in archaeology, attention for the workings of political institutions, a focus on eloquent expression, a sense of anachronism – are now identified throughout the late medieval chronicle tradition or, conversely, are found to be absent in texts considered to be humanist. 75 Most importantly, perhaps especially with regard to the so-called early modern period, this emphasis on the ‘new’ is highly misleading, creating as its reverse the suggestion of a Middle Ages which was stable, unchanging, and, above all, *different*. It should be self-evident, however, that throughout the Middle Ages, there was change; and, as Helen Cooper reminds us in her inaugural lecture for the chair of Medieval and Renaissance English Studies at Cambridge, this ‘change continued, and we notice the changes; but we need to rediscover how to *wonder* at the continuities that underlie them too’. 76 Historiography is the pre-eminent genre for the study of such continuities, due to its rigid demands with regard to both form and content.

73 Thus, the attention given to the Egmond tradition, the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ and the *Divisiekroniek*.


**Jan van Naaldwijk’s Sources**

In the introduction to his first chronicle Jan van Naaldwijk expresses his concern over the limited availability of sources for the history of Holland and claims that he delayed the work in expectation of the publication of a better source, which he believed was being written by a certain Willem Hermans, a monk of the monastery of Stein near Gouda. The anticipated text never materialized, but the issue of the sources for his chronicle was very much on Jan’s mind: after his introduction and table of contents, and before the text of his chronicle, he inserted a list of thirty-six works on which he had drawn. Jan could have read almost all the identifiable titles in printed editions. These sources, and Jan’s use of them in the writing of his first chronicle of Holland, will be the subject of the next chapter. ‘The true text, however’, Jan concluded his introduction, ‘of the chronicle and the counts of Holland I have mostly taken from a book made by one named Johannes van Beke’. Beke’s chronicle, which Jan – unlike the vast majority of his sources – is certain to have consulted in manuscript and not in print, and the only one which he mentions in his introduction, was indeed his main source.

From the time of its composition in the middle of the fourteenth century, Jan Beke’s chronicle of Holland and Utrecht, the *Chronographia* (Fig. 1) had been the most important source for the history of Holland. Originally written in Latin, a Dutch translation was completed in 1393, and a French one in the 1450s. It was continued in various phases in the Latin version up to the 1390s, and in the Dutch version up to 1430. It was widely disseminated, with twenty Latin, twenty-one Dutch, and seven French manuscripts surviving today, as well as numerous adaptations by named and anonymous authors. Up to our own times, there has been no historian of the medieval history of Holland who did not rely on it as a source, at least indirectly.

---

77 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r-v.
78 Tilmans, ‘Hollandse kroniek’; see below, Chapter 3, 173-181.
79 For a transcription of this list and identifications of the titles, see Documentary Appendix 1.
80 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r: ‘mer den rechten text van die cronijck ende grauen van hollant heb je meest ghenomen wt een boeck ghemaect bij enen johannes van [. .]jeke’.
THE HISTORIOGRAPHICAL TRADITION OF EGMOND

Jan Beke (Johannes [de] Beka), was a resident of the Benedictine monastery of Egmond in the second quarter of the fourteenth century.\(^83\) The earliest historical text written in and about Holland, the Life of St Adalbert (c. 985),\(^84\) was produced and preserved in Egmond; and due to successive acquisitions and periods of scribal activity over the centuries, the library of Egmond amassed a significant number of historical titles.\(^85\) By the time Jan Beke wrote his history at the monastery, it had acquired the status of the best local library for historians and was perfectly suited to his aim of writing the history of the county of Holland and the diocese of Utrecht.

The native production of historical texts had by this time developed into a real tradition of history writing: successive authors had built upon each other’s writings, and a straight line of descent can be traced from the earliest works, the lives of saints Adalbert and Hieron of Scotland (Jeroen of Noordwijk), the Counts’ Register and the Egmond Annals, through to the later Egmond Chronicle and finally the chronicle of Willelmus Procurator,\(^86\) Jan Beke’s older and less influential contemporary at the monastery. There is a clear evolution in this tradition from works on specific topics and limited chronological scope, mostly saints’ lives, to historical works covering longer time spans and more wide-ranging subjects, such as the annals of the Egmond monastery, and finally to fully fledged chronicles of the county and its political and ecclesiastical history.\(^87\)

---


85 For works from the second half of the 11th century onwards: J. P. Gumbert, ‘De Egmondse boekenlijst’, in G. N. M. Vis (ed.), In het spoor van Egbert, Aartsbisschop Egbert van Trier, de bibliotheek en geschiedschrijving van het klooster Egmond (Hilversum, 1997), pp. 151-79, nos 23, 24, 25, 27, 53, 63, 66, 136, 137, 150, 151, 152. Of the list of 18 identified manuscripts which were at Egmond but are not included in the list of acquisitions, 5 are historical works, suggesting that historical works may have been less likely to be recorded than other acquisitions. See also G. N. M. Vis, ‘Historiografie in middeleeuws Egmond’, in G. N. M. Vis, M. Mostert and P. J. Margry (eds), Heiligenlevens, annalen en kronieken. Geschiedschrijving in middeleeuws Egmond (Hilversum, 1990), pp. 9-21, at 10-14; P. H. D. Leupen, ‘Egmond en zijn bronnen’, in G. N. M. Vis, M. Mostert and P. J. Margry (eds), Heiligenlevens, annalen en kronieken. Geschiedschrijving in middeleeuws Egmond (Hilversum, 1990), pp. 23-34.


Jan Beke and Willelmus Procurator were residents in the fourteenth century while writing their Latin prose histories; but outsiders also appreciated its value as a depository of historical knowledge: half a century earlier the library had provided the sources for a rhymed Middle Dutch chronicle of Holland,\textsuperscript{88} and in the fifteenth century Johannes Gherbrandi a Leydis and Dirk Frankenszoon Pauw (Theodericus Pauli) visited it to find information for their chronicles.\textsuperscript{89} In the early sixteenth century, the monastery of Egmond would become a meeting place for humanist scholars, visited by Alardus Amstelredamus, Cornelius Aurelius, Martinus Dorpius, Bartholomeus Coloniensis and Johannes Murmellius.\textsuperscript{90}


\textsuperscript{89} Vis, ‘Historiografie’, pp. 14-21.

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid., p. 13.
Fig. 2: The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 130 C 10, fol. 153r: Jan Beke, *Croniken*: successive additions of the second half of the fifteenth century

Image from Medieval Manuscripts in Dutch Collections (www.mmdc.nl).
Jan Beke arrived at the monastery precisely at the time that this historical tradition of Egmond had reached its maximum potential for writing the history of the wider region, and he tapped into it to create his own distinctive historical vision, in which the county of Holland and the diocese of Utrecht had a shared past and a shared destiny.

In the introduction to his *Chronographia*, Beke describes the aims of his history, specifies its subject and scope, and comments on his *modus operandi*. He says that he wanted to preserve the memory of the deeds of the counts of Holland and the bishops of Utrecht, ‘to prevent the memory of such great men from perpetually lying under terrible forgetfulness due to the idleness of chroniclers, and their triumphal praise from being lost in eternal silence’. With this in mind, he had gathered together information from a variety of sources, which he had mostly, if not exclusively, found in the library of the abbey of Egmond. He drew on around thirty works, including ten large histories from further afield, such as those of Bede and Sigebert of Gembloux, ten saints’ lives and many sources from Utrecht, as well as from Egmond (the life of St Adalbert, for example, and the Egmond annals and chronicle). He must also have used a large number of charters and privileges.

Beke argued that his project to preserve the memory of historical events was necessary because past events held lessons for the present and for the future. The particular lesson to be learnt from the history of Holland and Utrecht was that the count of Holland and the bishop of Utrecht, together with their peoples, should maintain cordial relations in unity. He believed that the history of the county and the diocese could only be written together, because they were ‘promiscua’ – intertwined – and could not easily be separated without

---


92 Ibid., pp. xl-xliv (Bruch’s introduction).

93 Ibid., p. 3 (cap. 1): ‘Nam teste philosopho gesta temporum preteritorum certa sunt indicia presencium vel futurorum.’ Similar references to ‘the Philosopher’ indicate Aristotle; see for his comments on history, however, G. E. M. de Ste. Croix, ‘Aristotle on History and Poetry (Poetics 9, 1451’36–1451’11)’, in B. Levick (ed.), *The Ancient Historian and His Materials* (Westmead, 1975), pp. 45-58. Aristotle actually does not say (as the chronicles claim) that history is a sure sign of the present and the future, but that it is in fact not, as it deals in particulars, unlike poetry, which deals with universals.

94 Jan Beke, *Chronographia*, p. 3 (cap. 1): ‘quatenus ex ea discatis quam bonum et quam iocundum sit, vos et vestrum populum habere pacem in unum’; ‘Quamobrem pacem alterutrum observate, vestram amiciciam custodite, foreenses hostes subiugate et tam vos quam vestrum populum per concordiam inseparabilem adunite.’
losing sight of the ‘sentencia’, the meaning of history.\textsuperscript{95} He thus glossed over the fact that it must have cost him considerable effort to unite the disparate histories, viewpoints and chronologies of his sources into a single narrative – an effort which can be detected most clearly in the early part of the \textit{Chronographia}, in which chapters generally deal with either Utrecht or Holland, with a chapter on the latter generally followed by several on the former.\textsuperscript{96} The discrepancy in the quantity of material available to Beke regarding the county and the diocese caused a good deal of confusion in his narrative concerning the lifespan of some of the earliest counts of Holland. For instance, the relative abundance of sources about Utrecht, compared to those for Holland, in the period of the Danish raids in the tenth century, led Beke to calculate that the first two counts of Holland, Dirk I and his son Dirk II, together ruled the county for 125 years.\textsuperscript{97}

Beke’s political ideal dictated his view of history: convinced that the people of Holland and Utrecht were one, it followed that they had a shared history. Their origin as a single people found its apotheosis in unity under direct rule of the Roman emperors, only for them to be separated by the Frankish kings.\textsuperscript{98} Beke therefore lamented the corrupting influence of the political transformations of Western Europe in the Middle Ages and stressed the antiquity of the direct fealty owed by both the county of Holland and the diocese of Utrecht to the Empire;\textsuperscript{99} as we shall see in later chapters, this notion would be adapted by the historians from the sixteenth century onwards in their nostalgia for the classical period and exploited for the glorification of the history of the Netherlands.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{95} Ibid.: ‘Et quoniam gesta prefatorum pontificum et principum adeo sunt promiscua, quod aliquatenus segregari nequeant salva cronographie sentencia, ideoque vobis dominis meis precordialibus presentem historiam de gestis utrorumque sub breviori leviore stilo compilavimus.’

\textsuperscript{96} This becomes particularly clear from the chapter headings provided in the Dutch translation, which generally follows the chapter divisions of the Latin original; see, e.g., Beke, \textit{Croniken}, pp. 42-52 (capp. 28-35): ‘Hoe Kaerl die Cale coninc van Vrancrike ende van Roman gaf Dideric den edelen man die graefscap van Hollant.’ – ‘Van Odilbaldus den xii. bisscop’ – ‘Van Egilboldus den xiii. bisscop.’ – ‘Van Dideric, die die ander grave was’ – ‘Van Radbodus den xiii. bisscop’ – ‘Van Baldricus den xv. bisscop’ – ‘Van Folcmarus den xvi. bisscop’ – ‘Van Arnulfus den derden grave van Hollant’.

\textsuperscript{97} Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, p. 69 (cap. 36).

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid., p. 3 (cap. 1): ‘Vester etenim populus, ut patebit inferius, fuit unius nacionis et dicionis, immediate subjectus Romanis imperatoribus, antequam Hollandia bipartita fuit in pontificatum et principatum a divis Francorum regibus.’

\textsuperscript{99} Likewise in a dispute between Cologne and Utrecht concerning the primacy of religious authority of the two dioceses, where Utrecht claims direct loyalty to Rome: Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, pp. 27-29 (cap. 16).

\textsuperscript{100} See below, Chapter 3, p. 165; Chapter 4, p. 250. The innovation of the \textit{Divisiekroneck}, was not, as Tilmans, \textit{Historiography}, pp. 143-4, argues, the introduction of a three-stage historical model (classical–medieval–present), but its effort to date the original corruption of regional unity, not to the break-up of the Carolingian Empire (as in Beke), but instead to the earlier break-up of the Roman Empire – a historiographical development set in motion by several historians of the 15\textsuperscript{th} and early 16\textsuperscript{th} centuries who used Beke as a source, as we shall see below (pp. 56-58; Chapter 2, p. 91).
reality, the main focus of the *Chronographia* was on the political history of the county and the diocese; but he expressly intended his work to be the history of a single people.

While Beke’s model may have been plausible at the time, historians in the following two centuries would expend much energy on disentangling the double history he had created; and although the chronicle would continue to be copied in manuscript in its entirety for centuries,\(^{101}\) the work was not printed before the seventeenth century.\(^{102}\) By the late fifteenth century, the chronicle had become a source for the history of Holland, on the one hand, and for that of Utrecht, on the other; but the argument at its core would persistently be ignored and regularly written out of the text. As will be shown in the next chapter, like several scribes and authors before him,\(^{103}\) Jan van Naaldwijk chose to separate the histories of Holland and Utrecht.\(^{104}\)

Beke remains a dispassionate narrator throughout, hardly ever referring to himself as the author of the chronicle or to the process of writing his history. It is only the lack of sufficient sources for the early period which occasionally causes him to step into the foreground, complaining about the difficulties of conducting historical research on this subject.\(^{105}\) After the introduction, he never explicitly gives an opinion about the historical events he describes. Nevertheless, his view of the history of Holland and Utrecht as set out in his introduction had a direct impact on the organization of the chronicle. Unlike many other medieval histories of specific regions or domains, where, in line with the model provided by Orosius and Bede, the history is preceded by a geographical description of the country,\(^{106}\) in the *Chronographia* the dedicatory introduction is immediately followed by an historical account of the earliest settlements and foundations

---

101 Beke, *Chronographia*, p. xvii; see Fig. 35.
103 E.g., London, British Library, MS Cotton Titus D xxv, abbreviates the material concerning Holland while giving the full account about Utrecht; cf. also the local histories in the Dutch *Fasciculus temporum*, see below, pp. 70-73.
104 See below, Chapter 2, pp. 89, 153.
105 Beke, *Chronographia*, p. 39 (cap. 22c): ‘De quo nuspiam aliud inventur in cronicis vel in gestis, nisi quod idem tumulatus esse perhibetur cum reverendis pontificibus antedictis’; see also p. 25 (cap. 15b) and p. 49 (cap. 24d).
in Holland. In three consecutive chapters, Beke tells three stories in succession: firstly, that of the foundation of a city named Antonina after its founder, Antonius, a tribune exiled from Rome by Emperor Nero;\textsuperscript{107} secondly, the arrival of Slavs ‘who are also called Wilts’\textsuperscript{108} in the region originally inhabited by the Frisians, who destroyed Antonina and built ‘Wiltenburg’ (‘the Wilts’ Fortress’), which would, in turn, be destroyed when Emperor Valentinianus defeated the ‘rebellious people’;\textsuperscript{109} and thirdly, the foundation of the first castle and church at Utrecht by King Dagobertus of eastern Francia – and his failed attempt to convert the obstinate Frisians to Christianity.\textsuperscript{110}

So, in Beke’s chronicle, the central lesson to be learnt from the earliest history of Holland is apparent from the outset: all good things for the region come from unity under Rome, whereas evil comes from ‘rebelliousness’ and ‘obstinacy’ in opposing Rome. Only after this introduction to the earliest history of the region, with which he sets out the terms of reference for the rest of the chronicle, does Beke include the obligatory geographical description: the unified greater Holland under Dagobertus is described in a chapter based on the account of Bartholomeus Anglicus, who presented Holland with Utrecht (‘Trajectum Inferius’) as its capital and whose geography included the diocese as well as the county.\textsuperscript{111}

The reason why Beke placed the description of the country at this late point in the text, in contrast to the precedent established by Orosius and Bede, appears to be programmatic: it marked the last moment of political unity between Holland and Utrecht. In the chapter immediately following this descriptio, the county and the diocese are partitioned by two different grants of the Frankish kings. Although, according to his own account, these grants were separated in time by 165 years,\textsuperscript{112} Beke, in a single sentence spanning this period, reports that Charles Martel donated the first assets to the church of Utrecht and

\textsuperscript{107} Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, p. 5 (cap. 2).

\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., p. 7 (cap. 3), ‘Slavi qui et Wilti’; Burgers, \textit{Rijmkroniek van Holland en zijn auteurs}, p. 169, points out that the later notion of two peoples, the Slavs and the Wilts, stems from a mistranslation in the Middle Dutch version of Beke’s chronicle. See for the Wilten L. Hrabová, ‘Wiltenburg und der Holländische Mythus von den Anfängen’, in E. Kooper (ed.), \textit{The Medieval Chronicle}, III (2004), pp. 51-60, who argues that the story was part of an effort to show that Holland ‘had always been a special and independent people between Franks and Friesians’ (p. 51).

\textsuperscript{109} Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, p. 7 (cap. 3): ‘rebellantem ... populum’.

\textsuperscript{110} Ibid., p. 7 (cap. 4).


that Charles the Bald created the county of Holland by a donation.\textsuperscript{113} This enabled him to gloss over the disparate histories of Holland and Utrecht, and to set the stage for his combined history of the two.\textsuperscript{114} Ignoring the fact that the historical data about the region for this very early period concerned Utrecht alone, he claimed that since his most authoritative source, Bede’s \textit{Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum}, included an account of the first English missions to the continent, it provided the necessary information concerning the history of Holland as well as of Utrecht. His comment, that ‘in order to understand the beginnings of both the diocese of Utrecht and the county of Holland, we must commence from English history’,\textsuperscript{115} would reverberate throughout the historical tradition of Holland.\textsuperscript{116}

Beke’s desire to present the histories of Holland and Utrecht in combination led him to organize his work in such a way that a series of chapters on the county is generally followed by a series on the diocese. Usually each series is introduced by the succession of a new bishop or count, and concluded by his death and burial. Initially, the division between Utrecht and Holland is problematic for Beke: the authority over the two domains is strictly divided, but property and lands can be in dispute, and he is not always clear as to whose claims are justified. For instance, East Friesland had been given to Holland by one king, and to Utrecht by another.\textsuperscript{117} The chronicle rapidly turns into a history of the disputes over the lands in and around Utrecht and Holland, often between the bishop and the count, but also between the bishop or the count, on the one hand, and other local lords, on the other. Over the course of Beke’s history, the definition of the county and the diocese, their borders and the content and limits of their authority, becomes more clearly defined, with geographical location being proposed as the defining characteristic of feudal

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., p. 9 (cap. 6): ‘Nam et Karolus Martellus dux et maior domus Francorum contulit ad ecclesiam Traiectensem primam donacionem, et Karolus Calvus rex et postmodum imperator Romanorum tradidit ad comitatum Hollandiensem primitivam dicionem.’

\textsuperscript{114} The author of a rhymed chronicle of the bishops of Utrecht, based on Beke’s \textit{Chronographia} and later used by its Dutch translator, distanced himself from this part of Beke’s argument, stressing ‘dattet bisdom ijrst began / Eer ye greve wart van Hollant / Off in somich ander lant’: \textit{Croniken van den biscoppen van Utrecht} (Anholt, Fürstlich Salm-Salm’schen Bibliothek der Wasserburg, Ms. 42), ll. 83-6 (sic), as cited by A. Janse, ‘De Nederlandse Beke opnieuw bekeken’, \textit{Jaarboek voor Middeleeuwse Geschiedenis} 9 (2006), pp. 116-49, at 128.

\textsuperscript{115} Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, p. 9 (cap. 6): ‘Ut ergo tam episcopatus Traiectensis quam eciam comitatus Hollandiensis primordiale cognoscamus inicium, profecto convenit quod ex gestis Anglorum principale proponamus exordium.’

\textsuperscript{116} See below, pp. 57-58, 68; Chapter 3, p. 202; Chapter 4, p. 251.

\textsuperscript{117} Ibid., pp. 107-13 (cap. 54).
loyalty: people living in Utrecht owe their loyalty to the bishop, those living in Holland to the count, even when they were originally liegemen of the other.\textsuperscript{118}

Within this framework, the place of the Frisians in the history of the region, and their identity as a people, was the most fluid: on the one hand, they were the inhabitants with the longest uninterrupted history in the region; on the other, their identity was imprecisely delineated and changeable, and their relationship to the other peoples of Holland and Utrecht was not always clearly designated. In some passages, they are portrayed as a well defined people, claiming freedom from the authority of Utrecht and Holland, or any other imposed power\textsuperscript{119} – a freedom parallel to the one which would later be claimed for the Batavians. At other moments, the Frisians appear as the barbarous, rebellious and shadowy forerunners of the people of Holland. It seems the Hollanders were, at least in part, a people who had ceased to be Frisian when they converted to Christianity and, by implication, became civilized – a people defined by their religion and by the fact that they lived in the county. Hollanders are first mentioned in the narrative only after their conversion to Christianity.\textsuperscript{120} Beke appears to have been inspired by Bede’s \textit{Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum}, not only as a source of factual information, but also as a model for writing the history of a geographically, religiously and politically defined region. As with the English, the earliest history of Holland and Utrecht, according to Beke, is a story of conversion; but in Beke’s chronicle, unlike in Bede’s work, the true identity of the peoples of the region is not determined by their ancient origins and settlement history.

Initially in the chronicle, secular authorities serve to protect the religious institutions.\textsuperscript{121} With the establishment of the county of Holland, however, the relationship between secular and religious power becomes more problematic, with secular interests occasionally justifying interference in religious affairs, as when Dirk II replaces the nuns

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., pp. 157 (cap. 63e), 159 (cap 63f).

\textsuperscript{119} Thus, they refuse conversion, Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, p. 7 (cap. 4) – some manuscripts of the Dutch translation, Beke, \textit{Croniken}, p. 8, n. at l. 9, here interestingly read ‘vreselike vole’ instead of the appropriate ‘Vriessce vole’; also significant is the passage, Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, p. 17 (cap. 12), about King Radbod, who refuses to convert to Christianity because if he were to go to heaven, he would not be able to join his ancestors who, as pagans, were in hell.

\textsuperscript{120} There is no reference to a pagan Hollander. There is hardly a mention of Holland or Hollanders between cap. 6 (the chapter introducing the foundation of the church of Utrecht and the county) and cap. 27a (incursions of the Danes in Holland, following which the county is founded), the exception being p. 41 (cap. 23b); Frisians crop up throughout.

\textsuperscript{121} Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, p. 15 (cap. 11): ‘Hec utique sancta Traiectensis ecclesia merito regia plantacio dicta est, que multis regalibus predictis ac imperialibus previlegiis adornata est, in qua plures sacrosancti patres pristinis floruerunt temporibus, qui tam in morte quam in vita multis miraculorum claruere virtutibus’; ibid., pp. 55-7 (cap. 28).
of Egmond with monks, because they would be better able to defend the monastery in the event of further Danish raids.\textsuperscript{122}

In general, however, Beke takes the view that secular rulers should not presume to exert their authority over the church – or even to possess the authority to advise it.\textsuperscript{123} Beke himself did not include the charter, later inserted by the Dutch translator of the chronicle, in which Count Willem II granted immunity to the church of Utrecht. The document was widely available,\textsuperscript{124} so it is unlikely that Beke did not know about it; but even though the charter was issued by Willem in his capacity as Holy Roman emperor-elect, it suggested a relationship between Holland and Utrecht that was not in accordance with Beke’s historical and political vision.\textsuperscript{125}

Throughout the chronicle, Beke kept to his chosen subject: the history of the county of Holland and the diocese of Utrecht. Only rarely did he stray into extraneous matter – usually when recounting portents, such as the discovery at Constantinople of an ancient inscription prophesying the birth of Christ, a blood fountain at Geneva or the unearthing of a treasure by a Saracen in Apulia.\textsuperscript{126} Such portents occurred in various places in Europe and generally had little bearing on the historical narrative. Otherwise, Beke’s geographical scope expands only where events ‘abroad’ had a direct impact on Utrecht or Holland – as with the battle of Cassel in 1071, which was included because its outcome, the confirmation of Robert I ‘the Frisian’ as count of Flanders, created the conditions under which the county of Holland would be brought under the authority of Count Dirk V.\textsuperscript{127}

The high-point of Beke’s historical account was the rule of Count Willem II; his knighting and his elevation to Holy Roman emperor-elect provided the occasion for including a chivalric code, pronounced by the presiding cardinal during the ceremony.\textsuperscript{128} Here Beke demonstrated his skills as a narrator, utilizing the popular medieval technique

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{122} Ibid., p. 61 (cap. 33a).
\bibitem{123} This point is stressed in the episode describing the disagreement between Emperor Louis I (‘The Pious’) and Bishop Frederick of Utrecht: ibid., p. 49 (cap. 24d).
\bibitem{124} The charter was available in various copies in the archives of both county and diocese, as well as that of the city of Utrecht: Janse, ‘\textit{Nederlandse Beke’}, p. 133-35; J. G. Kruisheer, J. W. J. Burgers, E. C. Dijkhof et al., \textit{Oorkondenboek van Holland en Zeeland tot 1299}, 5 vols (Assen, etc., 1970-2005), II, p. 930.
\bibitem{125} Beke, \textit{Croniken}, pp. 127-9 (cap. 66).
\bibitem{126} Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, pp. 35 (cap. 20b), 67 (cap. 35b), 73 (cap. 39b).
\bibitem{127} Ibid., p. 89 (cap. 47b).
\bibitem{128} Beke, \textit{Croniken}, pp. 120-22 (cap. 66); Beke, \textit{Chronographia}, pp. 187-9 (cap. 70).
\end{thebibliography}
of embedding didactic material in narrative and dialogue to dramatic effect.\textsuperscript{129} His narration becomes a substitute for the ceremony itself, presenting a mirror of princes for his noble audience.

While taking inspiration from the venerable historian, Jan Beke was no Dutch Bede, and his grand narrative proved less persuasive. Nevertheless, his history had as much influence on the historiography of Holland as a source and model for later works as Bede’s had on that of the English. And unlike Bede’s history, which was intrinsically divisive and polarizing,\textsuperscript{130} Beke’s chronicle provided a potentially conciliatory, non-controversial view of the early history of the region, structured around the intertwining successions of counts and bishops. This made it a history which could be easily adjusted to changing political landscapes and, moreover, which could be readily detached from its core argument about the unity of Holland and Utrecht. In his desire to reconcile the powers of Holland and of Utrecht, Beke had made a particular effort to underplay the antagonism between them. Consequently, the two historical narratives which he had attempted to merge in his chronicle, informed by distinct sources from Holland and from Utrecht, could be disassembled by later historians when the centralization of regional power in the hands, first, of the dukes of Burgundy and, subsequently, of the Habsburgs paradoxically served as a stimulus to the production of local histories, focusing on individual principalities or aristocratic families.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{129} A famous example is the newborn St Rumwold whose elaborate instructions for baptism, as well as his sermon on the Trinity, were recorded in his \textit{vita}: R. C. Love, \textit{Three Eleventh-Century Anglo-Latin Saints’ Lives: Vita S. Birini, Vita et Miracula S. Kenelmi, Vita S. Rumwoldi} (Oxford, 1996), pp. 91-115.


\textsuperscript{131} On this development, which existed alongside the impulse to write universal histories, see: Lettinck, ‘Character’; an example of a contemporary universal chronicle is Florarium temporum. \textit{Een wereldkroniek uit het jaar 1472}, ed. P. C. Boer (The Hague, 1951); for a good survey of the historiographical activity connected to the court of Philip the Good, see G. Small, ‘Local Elites and “National” Mythologies in the Burgundian Dominions in the Fifteenth Century’, in R. Suntrup and J. R. Veenstra (eds), \textit{Building the Past – Konstruktion der eigenen Vergangenheit} (Frankfurt am Main, 2006), pp. 229-45, at 245: ‘In retelling the myths most associated with their region, local elites staked out a place for their political and historical culture within the composite Burgundian state.’ Claes Heynenzoon (see below, pp. 45-48), writing a chronicle of Holland, on the one hand, and a universal chronicle, on the other, is an early example of this development; Jan van Naaldwijk, as will become clear in Chapter 2 below, is an interesting exception.
THE HISTORIOGRAPICAL TRADITION IN HOLLAND AFTER JAN BEKE

The late fourteenth century witnessed a notable surge in the production of historical manuscripts in Holland. Both universal histories and histories of Holland received increasing attention. Jacob van Maerlant’s *Spiegel historiael* of the late thirteenth century (a rhymed Dutch translation of Vincent of Beauvais’s *Speculum historiale*, and the foundational text of Dutch historiography), as well as the Middle Dutch rhymed chronicle of Holland mentioned above, which was written in the decades around 1300, underwent their most active dissemination in Holland during this period. Four known new copies of the rhymed chronicle were made in Holland at this time, while Maerlant’s *Spiegel*, which had previously circulated mainly in the southern Dutch Low Countries, was now also copied and recopied in Holland.

Initially, older works were transcribed, continued further in time and translated, with the translators and rewriters faithfully copying the introductions, including claims of authorship and intent, along with the texts. Around the turn of the century, however, new works, more or less dependent on the historiographical tradition, started to be composed by authors who wrote their own introductions and who claimed authorship, even when their texts were often little more than adaptations of existing chronicles. The increased recycling of older works at the end of the fourteenth century appears to have been the stimulus for the production of new compositions in the early fifteenth century. As we shall see in the next chapters, a similar scenario would repeat itself in the early sixteenth century.

The rise in historiographical activity around 1400 was not confined to the county of Holland. There was a parallel development in the diocese of Utrecht; and it was here that, in or shortly after 1393, an anonymous citizen translated Jan Beke’s Latin

---


135 Thus, first the translation of Beke’s *Chronographia*, which carries the attribution to the author of the Latin original, and the new manuscripts of other historical texts, mentioned above; later Claes Heyenzoon, who claims authorship of his ‘Chronicle of Holland’ as ‘ic Beyeren’ (J. Verbij-Schillings, *Beeldvorming in Holland: heraut Beyeren en de historiografie omstreeks 1400* [Amsterdam, 1995], pp. 307-8), but also the chronicle of the explicitly anonymous clerk.

Chronographia into Dutch (Fig. 2). This Dutch translation can be seen as the starting-point for a new historiographical impulse; and while the Latin Chronographia did not cease to exert influence on later authors, the Dutch version served as a source for many of the later chronicles of Holland. It is a close translation of the original text, including a continuation from 1346 to 1393 independent from the Latin tradition, plus minor additions to the text of the original chronicle. These additions were based on several sources, some of which were available exclusively in the Utrecht city archive. Like the continuation, they are mostly focused on Utrecht; and, as we have seen with the inclusion of the grant of immunity by Count Willem II of Holland to the church of Utrecht, they occasionally distort, or at the least, complicate Beke’s central message. Moreover, in the continuation, the author shows little interest in the religious affairs of the diocese – his is an account of the secular affairs of the bishops. All in all, however, the ‘Dutch Beke’ does not present a significantly different version of history from the original Chronographia, except for the obvious fact of its language. There would be a resurgence of Latin history writing in the second half of the fifteenth century; but around 1400, Dutch had overtaken Latin as the language of choice for new historical works about Holland.

This was indicative of another change: history writing had become less a prerogative of the monasteries. The increase in Latin historical works during the second half of the fifteenth and the early part of the sixteenth century would largely be driven by priests and canons; but the three most significant historians of Holland around 1400 were all attached to the civil administration as secretaries. Initially, it was only monastic writers who had access to the substantial bodies of sources required to produce works of relative originality concerning the history of Holland. At the end of the thirteenth century, the growth of civil bureaucracies started to provide a second institutional context for historiographical production; but these new secular historians were still largely dependent on access to monastic collections for their sources. The growing prestige of the court

137 Beke, Croniken.
138 Ibid., pp. ix-xxvi (Bruch’s introduction).
139 Janse, ‘Nederlandse Beke’, pp. 119, 133-5.
140 See above, p. 39.
142 See below, Chapter 4, p. 246.
143 Thus, Melis Stote, who completed the ‘Rhymed Chronicle of Holland’, relied on significantly fewer sources than the original author, who had visited Egmond: Burgers, Rijmkroniek van Holland en haar auteurs, pp. 271-2, 277-81.
culture of the counts of Holland, as well as the increasing importance of the cities, apparently created environments in which it became possible for lay authors to amass historical knowledge about Holland, either by drawing on civil collections and libraries, as in the case of the author of the ‘Dutch Beke’, or by extensive travel to study in monastic libraries, subsidized by the court, as in the case of Claes Heynenzoon, herald for the dukes of Guelders from the 1380s and for the count of Holland from the early years of the fifteenth century.

144 F. van Oostrom, Court and Culture: Dutch Literature, 1350-1450 (Berkeley, 1992).
146 Verbij-Schillings, Beeldvorming, pp. 105-51. It remains to be determined how several anonymous chronicles fit into this development, e.g., the short Dutch prose chronicle of Holland, apparently written around the second decade of the fifteenth century and preserved in two versions: The Hague, Museum Meermanno, MSS 10 D 36 and 10 D 37 (Narrative Sources, no. NL0430).
Fig. 3: The Hague, Museum Meermanno, MS 10 D 36, fol. 1r: a late fifteenth-century manuscript of Claes Heynenzoon’s chronicle of Holland

Image from Medieval Manuscripts in Dutch Collections (www.mmdc.nl).
Claes Heynenzoon, ‘Herald Beyeren’

After having served Willem van Oostervant, on occasion, before he became duke of Bavaria and count of Holland, Claes Heynenzoon joined Willem’s court as a herald, capping a distinguished career in this field. The position demanded a thorough knowledge of the history of the aristocracy in the region and of their arms; both in tournaments and on the battlefield, it was the herald’s task to identify the combatants and to record their accomplishments. Claes’s professional interest in heraldry and history translated into an impressive historiographical programme. The most prolific historian of the region in his day, he produced, in a period of less than five years during the first decade of the fifteenth century, four sizeable prose histories in Dutch: a world chronicle and a chronicle of Holland, both in two substantially different versions. He drew on at least thirty sources in verse as well as prose, and in Latin as well as Dutch. Many of his sources would have been available at or near the court of the counts of Holland. Remarkably for this period, six of his autograph manuscripts have been preserved, each of which contains, in addition to the historical works, heraldic images painted by Claes himself.

Both for historical information and for the structure of his chronicle of Holland (Fig. 3), which he dedicated to Count Willem VI, Heynenzoon relied on the Dutch translation of Beke’s Chronographia as his main source. He did not, however, heed Beke’s plea for a combined history of Holland and Utrecht. On the contrary, his aim was to write an exclusively regional and dynastic history, for, as he wrote: ‘it seems inappropriate to me that the lords of the lands know many foreign histories, but do not know where they themselves came from and who were the first in olden times in the lands they now hold and by means of which they sustain themselves.’ He therefore deliberately set out to

---

148 Claes Heynenzoon’s chronicles of Holland have not been published. I have relied on J. Verbij-Schillings, Beeldvorming, and The Hague, Museum Meermanno, MS 10 C 14, the ‘Holland’ version of his chronicle of Holland.

149 Verbij-Schillings, Beeldvorming, pp. 24, 176 and 211-84.

150 Ibid., p. 226.

151 Ibid., pp. 103-4.

152 Ibid., p. 87.

153 Ibid., p. 38. The manuscripts are Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique/Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België, MSS 15652-6 (‘Armorial Guelders’), 17914 (‘Chronicle of Holland’); Gotha, Landesbibliothek, Membr. II 219 (two laudatory speeches, fragment); ‘Armorial Beyeren’ (privately owned); The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MSS 131 G 37 (‘The Hague manuscript’), 71 H 39 (‘Notebook’).

154 Museum Meermanno, MS 10 C 14, fol. 1r: ‘Oec soo en duunct mij nijet wel vueghen dat die heren van den lande veel vreemder ijeesten weten ende sijs nijet wijs en zijn waen zij zelue gecomen zijn, ende wie die eerste waeren inden ouden tijden, dair zij tlantr nu of besitten ende nutscap dair of hebben dair sij of leuen’.
purge Beke’s chronicle of material concerning Utrecht,\textsuperscript{155} as well as adding information about Holland taken from other sources, including the popular \textit{Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum} of Martinus Oppaviensis (Martinus Polonus or Martin von Troppau),\textsuperscript{156} the Dutch translation of Vincent of Beauvais’s \textit{Speculum historiale}, the Dutch rhymed chronicle of Holland and several shorter works.\textsuperscript{157} If the sources available to him offered a choice between a slant on events oriented towards either Utrecht or a Holland (or, as Beke often did, a neutral perspective), he consistently opted for Holland.\textsuperscript{158} When he eventually revamped the chronicle, he gave the full succession of the bishops of Utrecht, having previously included material on the diocese only where it was directly relevant to the affairs of the counts of Holland; yet even in this revised ‘Holland-Utrecht’ version of the chronicle, which he dedicated to Bishop Frederick as well as Count Willem, he remained decidedly partial to Holland.

A significant shift in Claes’s work, compared to his sources, was his interest in dynastic origins and in the sources of secular power. He sought a more precise demarcation of the history of the counts of Holland, as opposed to the history of the region, but also one which could be traced further back in time than earlier works had done, ultimately to Adam.\textsuperscript{159} He organized his chronicle according to the principal characters; more than a chronological history, it was a series of portraits of famous rulers. In the ‘Holland-Utrecht’ revision of the chronicle, this led to a breakdown in the chronology. Having decided to expound the history of the area before the creation of the county of Holland by means of alternating portraits of one bishop and one Carolingian king (and later, one Holy Roman emperor) in succession, to which from its creation the counts were also added, the bishops were soon a century ahead of the counts and emperors.\textsuperscript{160} Beke had written his chronicle from the perspective of the Low Countries. Claes chose instead to look at the history of the region from the perspective of Carolingian Europe and the Holy Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{161} Although he was the first historian of Holland to mention the myth of the Trojan origin of the Carolingian kings,\textsuperscript{162} he did not

\textsuperscript{155} Verbij-Schillings, \textit{Beeldvorming}, pp. 70, 96, 327-9.
\textsuperscript{156} Martinus Oppaviensis, \textit{Chronicon pontificum et imperatorum}, ed. L. Weiland, Monumenta Germaniae Historia Scriptores 22 (Hanover, 1872), pp. 377-475.
\textsuperscript{157} Verbij-Schillings, \textit{Beeldvorming}, pp. 76-8.
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid., pp. 121-2, 183-5.
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., p. 107.
\textsuperscript{160} Ibid., pp. 126-8.
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., pp. 131.
\textsuperscript{162} Ibid., pp. 134-5, 139-41.
connect this heritage to the counts of Holland (although he did say that Dirk I was related to the Carolingians). He did, however, carry Beke’s claim of the original independence of Holland within the Roman Empire into the period when the county was under the Carolingian rule by maintaining that the emperor bestowed the territory on the counts of Holland ‘as a free loan’. 163

Apparently dissatisfied with Beke’s lack of clarity on the relationship between Holland and Friesland, 164 Claes stated in his introduction that he had written a history of the counts of Holland ‘and of how far their justice and sovereignty extended into Friesland’. 165 In the chronicle itself, the separation between Holland and Friesland is made explicit: Claes adds to Beke’s description of how the region came to be ruled by Dagobertus the comment that the Frankish king ‘separated it from Friesland’. 166 The descriptio of Holland, in Claes’s chronicle, does not follow the unification of the region as it had in Beke’s work; instead, it comes after the first wars between the Christian Hollanders and the pagan Frisians. 167 In this way, the earliest history of Holland was no longer defined by an original greater unity in the region, but rather by the wars between Hollanders and Frisians. 168 Although keen to assert the free status of Holland within the Roman Empire, Claes dismissed the Frisians’ claim of ‘freedom’, which had been mentioned by Beke, 169 as a heresy, using it to justify Holland’s attempts to submit the Frisians to its rule, in terms which seem reminiscent of calls for a crusade:

They always want to be free, not under submission, without a lord. God has said in the Gospel: ‘Give to God the things that are God’s, and to the emperor the things that are the emperor’s’ [Matthew 22:21]. They [i.e., the Frisians] desire to have freedom above this. But nowhere can one find it written that a people that received life was so good

---

163 Ibid., p. 144: ‘tot enen vryen leen’; for Beke, see above, p. 34.

164 See above, p. 38.

165 Museum Meermanno, MS 10 C 14, fol. 1r: ‘wie die hollansche greuen waeren die hollant eerst onder hadden ende regierden, ende hoe ver huier recht ende huier heerlicht ghicn in vrieslant’.

166 Ibid., fol. 3r: ‘In des keysers Eraclius tiden voirscreuen soe was een coninc in oestvrancrijck die dagobertus hiete ende was des groten coninc lotharius zoen Ende was die eerste kerstijn coninc van vrieslant ende dede hollant in sijn bedwanc ende dede hollant in zijn bedwanc, ende dede weder maken een casteel van sunderlingen groten tymmere’; cf. Beke, Croniken, p. 7 (cap. 4): ‘Daerna een deel jaren alse Eraclius keyser was, in dien tiden was een coninc in Oostvrancrije die Dagobertus hiet ende hadde Hollant in sijn bedwanc, ende dede weder maken een casteel van sunderlingen groten tymmere’.

167 Museum Meermanno, MS 10 C 14, fol. 3r

168 He is dismissive of stories in which Frisians could take pride, such as the supposed occupation by Charlemagne of Rome with the aid of Frisian troops: ibid., 9r: ‘dats al gelogen dit beroemen hem die vriese ende seggen dat sij kaerle romen wonnen soud hise vri hebben ghemaect Sijjn hystorie en ghewaeght vandien vriese’.

169 See above, p. 38.
that it did not need government and a lord over it in order to live in honour – surely, God is the Lord in heaven and over all, a single lord above all others. And Lucifer is the lord and master in hell, and the pope and the emperor on earth.\textsuperscript{170}

\textsuperscript{170} Museum Meermanno, MS 10 C 14, 16r: ‘zoe willen si vmmere vrij wesen ombedwongen sonder heer Ende god gesproken heeft inder ewangelie men sal goede gheuen tsine ende den keyser tsine hyr en bouen willen sij vri sitten Ende men nerghent bescreuen en vijnt dat ye soe goet vole leuen onttenck ten most steer ende meyster ouer hem hebben selt in eren leuen ja god is heer in den hemel ende ouer all ende die een engel heer bouen den andren Ende lucifer heer ende meyster in die helle en die paeus op eertrijck ende die keyser’.
Fig. 4: Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS VI E 9 (cat. 1177): a late fifteenth-century manuscript of the chronicle of Holland of the ‘anonymous clerk’

Image from Medieval Manuscripts in Dutch Collections (www.mmdc.nl)
THE ‘ANONYMOUS CLERK FROM THE LOW COUNTRIES BY THE SEA’

Probably in the second decade of the fifteenth century, ‘an anonymous clerk, born in the Low Countries by the sea, who by his own free will desired to write truthful history’, as he described himself, wrote a history of Holland based on the ‘Dutch Beke’ as well as the ‘Holland-Utrecht’ version of Claes Heynenzoon’s ‘Chronicle of Holland’. In the introduction (Fig. 4), the anonymous clerk explicitly challenged Beke’s model of combining the history of Holland and Utrecht. Referring to himself in the third person, he described how he had set about writing his chronicle:

he gathered together the books and texts which tell of the blessed bishops of Utrecht and of the noble lords of Holland in combination, and he extracted the deeds and chronicles of the noble counts from the others. He is particularly eager to write about how the principality of Holland originated, from the world’s beginning, and who governed and administered that rich county with a knightly sword. He does not want to treat the sanctity of the fathers and bishops here, but only the history of the lords of Holland in the past; with that he will content himself. As wise men say: too many cooks spoil the broth.

So, in his opinion, Beke had brought together material which should have been treated separately. He evidently did not share Beke’s view that Holland and Utrecht were inhabited by a single people and therefore had a single history. His attitude was probably influenced by the fact that he wrote the chronicle for Count Willem VI of Holland. The court of Holland had found a new political stability under Willem’s father Albert, and its increased prestige left little room for Beke’s notion of regional unity. The clerk’s proximity to the court certainly did not encourage him to show any favours towards Utrecht.

---


173 Clerc, Kronijk, p. 2: ‘soe heeft hi daer om die boeke ende scriften wtgesocht, die mencie maken van den heylighen bisscopen van Utrecht ende van den edelen vorsten van Hollant in ghesamender vormen, ende die yeesten ende croniken der edelre graven wt den anderen getogen, daer hi bisonder of scriven wil, hoe die heerlichheit van Hollant van der werelt aenbegin haercomen is, ende wie si geweest siin, die die ryke graeefscap mitten ridderlichen zwaerde gheregierd ende beheert hebben; want hi alhier mitter heylichheit der vaderen ende bisscopen niet te sticken en wil hebben, dan alleen mitten historien der vorsten van Hollant, die inder tyt gheweest hebben, daer wil hi hem up dese tyt mede laten genoegen: want te veel tsamen geslagen bringet verdrriet, als die vroede spreken.’

174 Oostrom, Court, pp. 293-4.
He did, however, accept Beke’s argument that the peoples of Holland and Utrecht, as he paraphrased it: ‘in olden times, when they all used to be called Frisians, were one people, with one religion and one culture, directly subservient to the Roman Empire’.

But, in contrast to Claes Heynenzoon’s insistence on the distinction between Hollanders and Frisians, the clerk glossed over Beke’s ambiguities by conflating all the peoples who had occupied the region in ancient times. Where in Beke’s work, and also subsequently in Claes Heynenzoon’s, the Frisians had been set up as the everlasting adversaries of the Hollanders, the clerk denied them their own separate historical existence; both positions can be seen as historiographical expressions of hostility against Frisian claims of independence from Holland’s rule.

For the clerk, the unity of Holland and Utrecht was strictly historical, lasting only ‘until the time that they were divided into two by the illustrious kings of France and Germany, to whom they were subservient’. After this division, the peoples of Holland and Utrecht followed different paths and had their own separate histories. Perhaps aware that by leaving Utrecht, for the most part, out of his chronicle, there was not much to say about the early history of the region, the clerk included the popular exemplum of Udo of Magdeburg, the licentious bishop who refused to heed the admonitions of the Virgin Mary and was beheaded by the devil. It is only in this section of the chronicle that such a long passage of seemingly extraneous material is inserted into the narrative. There is a further indication that the chronicler was concerned about the scarcity of information concerning the early period. Apparently feeling unease about the long duration of the combined rule of Holland’s first two counts, the clerk notes, after repeating Beke’s calculation of the length of their reign, ‘that, apart from what you have heard earlier, one cannot find much written about their pious deeds’.

The clerk had little interest, however, in elaborating on Beke’s account of the early settlement of the peoples in the region, as later authors would do. The Slavs and the Wilts

---

175 Clerc, *Kronijk*, pp. 3-4: ‘in ouden tiden als si alle Vriesen plaghen te hieten, een volc was van enen gelove ende van eenre maniere, sonder middel onderdanich den heyligen roomschen ryck’.

176 Ibid., p. 4: ‘totter tijt toe dat si van den doirluchtighen coningen van Vrancryc ende van Germanien, onder wies onderdanicheit si waren, in tween ghideelt worden’.


178 See above, p. 34.

are treated as invaders with no particular link to, nor longevity in, the area. In an addition to Beke’s version of the events, they are explicitly identified as Danes, a people known for their destructive behaviour, but with no history of settling in the region, at least not in the historical tradition of Holland. In this chronicle, the different peoples living in the area were formed by dynastic politics, not by their settlement histories.

In line with his focus on dynasties and their politics, the clerk develops a new kind of history of origins: on several occasions he includes dynastic mythologies in his chronicle. So, for example, in a passage where his source, the ‘Dutch Beke’, reads: ‘Several years later, when Heraclius was emperor, in those times there was a king of eastern Francia who was called Dagobertus and who had Holland in his possession’ – a passage which, as we have seen above, Claes Heynenzoon had used for a jibe against the Frisians – the clerk makes some subtle changes: ‘Several years later, when Heraclius was emperor, in those times there was a king of the Franks who was called Dagobertus and who was descended from Francus of Troy. This King Dagobertus took possession of Holland.’ Not only is Dagobertus a more active agent in the clerk’s description than in Beke’s, taking possession of Holland rather than merely possessing it, but, more importantly, the mythology of the Trojan origin of the Western European ruling houses, which had entered the historiographical tradition of Holland in the work of Claes Heynenzoon, received confirmation and elaboration. While Trojan ancestry is not explicitly claimed for the counts of Holland, it is implied by a small but significant addition to the account of the ‘Dutch Beke’: in the description of the first count, the anonymous clerk mentions that he was ‘born from the monarchy of the Franks’, whose Trojan heritage has already been established.

But the clerk was anxious to show that in spite of their being descendants of the Frankish kings, the counts were by no means subservient to the French monarchy. With

---

180 Ibid., p. 5: ‘die Slaven ende die Wilten, dat ziin Denen’.
181 Beke, Croniken, p. 7 (cap. 4): ‘Daerna een deel jaren alse Eraclius keyser was, in dien tiden was een coninc in Oostvrancrijc die Dagobertus hiet ende hadde Hollant in sijn bedwanc’.
182 See above, p. 47.
183 Clerc, Kronijk, p. 7: ‘Daer na een deel iaren als Eraclius keyser was, in dien tiden was een coninck der Vrancken die Dagobertus hiete, ende was gecomen van Vranck van Troeien. Dese coninck Dagobertus brochte Hollant in sii bedwanc’ (my emphasis).
184 See above, p. 46.
185 Beke, Croniken, pp. 42-5 (cap. 28); Clerc, Kronijk, p. 21: ‘geboren van der crone van Vranckken’.
186 Ibid., p. 8: ‘Vrancriick dat nu Vrancken lant hiet; alsoe die edel Vranck van Troyen, die tlant biden riin eerst begreep ... doe hi van Troyen verdreven was mitten sinen, daer die coningen van Vrancken of ghecomen siin’.
regards to the foundation of the county of Holland, therefore, he pointed out that it came into being as a donation by the kings of Germany, not of France. Two long paragraphs in the early part of the chronicle, additions to the material provided by Beke’s chronicle, explain the difference between contemporary France and the original kingdom of the Franks, in order to argue that the fiefdom was bestowed on the counts by imperial rather than royal authority.  

The clerk contributed several pieces of information to the historical tradition of Holland. For example, he was the first to state that the king referred to by Beke as Aurindilus ‘was called Donkey’s Ears in Dutch’. Also, the death of Countess Machteld of Holland and her burial in Loosduinen, described by Beke, inspired the clerk to include a passage about her daughter, Countess Margaret of Hennenberg, who gave birth to 364 (some accounts have 365) children. The two episodes were enlarged on in the historiographical tradition of Holland and will be discussed in the following chapter, since Jan van Naaldwijk dealt in detail with both narratives in his first chronicle.

---

187 Ibid., pp. 20-21, 24. The matter was a bone of contention throughout Europe; as late as 1714, a French scholar was jailed for claiming that the ancestors of the French were German, not Trojan: R. Waswo, ‘Our Ancestors, the Trojans: Inventing Cultural Identity in the Middle Ages’, Exemplaria 7 (1995), pp. 269-90, at 273. In the chronicle of the clerk, however, the Trojan genealogy is combined with an argument for the Germanic nature of the Frankish monarchy.


189 Beke, Croniken, p. 19 (cap. 65).

190 Clerc, Kronijk, pp. 87-8.

191 For King Donkey’s Ears, see below, Chapter 2, pp. 155-158; for the countess of Hennenberg, pp. 126-129 and Chapter 4, pp. 226, 247, 249 and 256.
Fig. 5: *Chronike of Historie van Hollant, Zeelant ende Vrieslant ende van den sticht van Utrecht* (Leiden, 1483), sig. a2r: ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, prologue

Image from The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek (www.kb.nl).
Fig. 6: The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 75 H 34, fol. 18r: ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, manuscript copy after a printed exemplar

Image from Medieval Manuscripts in Dutch Collections (www.mmdc.nl).
The ‘Chronicle of Gouda’

In the third decade of the fifteenth century, an anonymous author wrote a short chronicle, consisting of a selection of material concerning Holland taken from the Dutch version of Jan Beke’s chronicle, supplemented by information from various other chronicles: Claes Heynenzoon’s accounts of Holland and of world history, as well as another brief Dutch prose work on Holland.192 Soon afterwards, it was reworked by another author, who added new introductory matter; and in this version the chronicle would have a massive impact on the later historiography of Holland. The chronicle was later continued in two different phases, in 1456 and in 1477,193 before becoming the first history of Holland to appear in print, published by Gerard Leeu, in Gouda, in 1478.194 In the seventeenth century it became known, with reference to the place of its first printing, as Het oude Goutsche chronycxken (‘The Old Short Chronicle of Gouda’).195

The supplementary material included an account of the pre-history of Holland, which provided the kind of foundation myth that had only been ambiguously present in Jan Beke’s chronicle. The account details the earliest inhabitants of the region, the foundation of its first cities, as well as the origin and etymology of the geographical place names,196 and it concludes with the establishment of Holland’s first count.197 This type of origin history had become current throughout Western Europe since the appearance of Geoffrey of Monmouth’s Historia regum Britannie, and it is not coincidental that several of the elements of the story of Holland’s settlement derive from the tradition begun by Geoffrey.

194 ‘Chronicle of Gouda’: Die cronike of die hystorie van Hollant van Zeelant ende Vrieslant ende van den sticht van Utrecht (Gouda, 1478) (Goff N1).
195 P. Scriverius (ed.), Het oude Goutsche chronycxken van Hollandt, Zeelandt, Vrieslandt en Utrecht (Amsterdam, 1663). The consecutive versions of this chronicle are set out in Janse, ‘De Historie’; for a provocative new interpretation of the intentions of its authors, see W. Keesman, ‘De Hollandse oudheid in het “Gouds kroniekje”: over drukpers en geschiedschrijving’, Spiegel der letteren 49 (2007), pp. 165-82. The first modern edition, taking account of the manuscript and printed witnesses, is being prepared by A. Janse.
196 It is striking that A. Janse, who makes much of a shift from Dynastisch-territoriale Geschichtsschreibung (Beke) to Landesgeschichtsschreibung in this chronicle (‘De Historie’, pp. 30-1), does not observe the urban nature of this new historiography: the examples he provides to illustrate the shift away from the counts as the focus of the chronicle are all of city foundations; and the events are set in an urban landscape. Nonetheless, this work, like all other medieval chronicles of Holland, is organized as a succession of counts.
197 ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. a2r, prologue: ‘hoe dat lant eerst begrepen ende bewoent wort Ende wye sy waren die die steden eerst begrepen ende betymmerden, ende hoe si hoer namen eerst creghen, ende hoe dat lant nae beheert wort van graue dirc die eerste graue’.
After a very brief introductory note setting out the subject of the chronicle (Fig. 5) and omitting any geographical description, the work starts innovatively with the fall of Troy, the subsequent capture by Brutus and his people of the island of Albion, which they would call Britain, freely following the history of Britain as described by Geoffrey of Monmouth. Geoffrey had intended his work as a replacement for Bede’s account of the early history of the British Isles; and it must have been recognized that his narrative could also be appropriated to replace Bede’s history as a source for the earliest history of Holland. Such a substitution had become necessary when Utrecht was left out of the story, since Bede’s work was primarily linked to ecclesiastical history and, therefore, to the diocese.

As we have seen, the clerk had beefed up this early part of his chronicle with extraneous matter in order to cover up the lack of information at his disposal. The author of this chronicle instead seized the opportunity to replace Bede’s history with Geoffrey of Monmouth’s: a new element in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ is the identification of the giants who inhabited the island of Albion and who, according to Geoffrey, were expelled by Brutus and his men, with the Slavs. Now, not only the earliest Christians but also the earliest inhabitants of the region were associated with British settlement history, as recounted by Geoffrey rather than Bede. In Beke’s account, the Slavs had first entered the history of the region when they destroyed Antonina; in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, they arrive long before the first mention of Antonina and establish the ‘Slavenburg’ – the ‘Slavs’ Fortress’, a stronghold unknown to Beke. After their expulsion by Brutus, in an interesting mirror image of the later Anglo-Saxon invasion of Britain, the


199 Levelt, ‘This book’.

200 See above, p. 51.

201 In my view, maintaining a link to legendary British history, after the excision of Bede’s narrative, was the principal reason for introducing the story of the giants of Britain. The claim by Janse, ‘De Historie’, p. 28, that, for the chronicle’s author, it was ‘een eigen reconstructie ... waarin hij ongetwijfeld zelf geloofd heeft’, denies him both creative imagination and critical faculties. The interesting suggestion by Keesman, ‘Hollandse oudheid’, p. 175, that the story is a politically inspired anti-myth, devised in Utrecht and intended to deride the Hollanders, rests on the assumption that giants in medieval narrative are always seen in a negative light; however, the Albina story, with its simultaneously negative and positive connotations, the latter of which were emphasized over time, shows that this was not necessarily the case: J. P. Carley and J. Crick, ‘Constructing Albion’s Past: An Annotated Edition of *De origine gigantium*, *Arthurian Literature* 13 (1995), pp. 41-114. Keesman is correct to assert that even if the story was originally meant negatively, it was not necessarily read that way.

202 Beke, *Chronographia*, p. 5 (cap. 2).
Slavs initially arrive in the country of the ‘wild Saxons, which is now called Friesland’. When they are expelled by these Saxons, the Slavs settle close to the ‘Merciless Forest’, in the place where the city of Vlaardingen would later be situated. ‘This was the first origin of Holland.’

Beke’s message that the inhabitants of Holland and Utrecht are a single people is lost, and even his hazy Slavs, ‘who are also called Wilts’, become two well-defined and distinct peoples. In this account, there is no confusion as to the identity of the different peoples of the region and their origins: ‘the Slavs are now Hollanders. The Lower Saxons are now Frisians, and the Wilts are now the people of the diocese of Utrecht.’

The ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ thus clarified some of the uncertainties in Beke’s chronicle.

Subverting Beke’s belief that the foundation of Antonina was followed by the arrival of the Slavs/Wilts, the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ has the Slavs, now a product of the British colonization of Albion, arrive in the region long before the first Roman presence there. Only after they are securely settled was Antonina founded – its destruction and the construction of the Slavs’ Fortress are treated as examples of early cooperation between the different peoples of Holland and Utrecht in opposition to foreign usurpers, not (as in Beke’s account) instances of the destructive behaviour of a ‘rebellious people’ when they first arrived in the region.

A final addition using elements from Geoffrey of Monmouth’s version of history completes the story: the Slavs, illustrious ancestors of the people of Holland, were the only continental European people to resist King Arthur successfully in battle. For Beke, the people of Holland and Utrecht owed direct fealty to the Roman Empire. The author of the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ enhanced this semi-independent status by having the ancestors of the Hollanders, the Slavs, win for themselves the right to determine their own affairs: ‘and they would remain free, without tribute’.

---

203 ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. a3v: ‘wilder sassen ... dat nu vrieslant is gehiethen’.
204 Ibid., sig. a3v-a4r: ‘Ende dit was dat eerste begrijp van hollant’. For the ‘Merciless Forest’ as a symbol of lawlessness, barbarism and paganism, see M. Carasso-Kok, ‘Het Woud zonder Genade’, Bijdragen en mededelingen betreffende de geschiedenis der Nederlanden 107 (1992), pp. 241-63.
205 Beke, Chronographia, p. 7 (cap. 3): ‘Slavi qui et Wilti’.
206 ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. a6r: ‘die slauen dat nv hollanders sijn Die nedersassen dat sijn nu vryesen, ende die wilten dat sijn nv die stichs van vtrecht’.
207 Beke, Chronographia, p. 7 (cap. 3): ‘rebellantem ... populum’
208 ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sigs a8v-b1r: ‘Ende si souden vry sitten sonder scatten’. I am not certain whether we should assume an underlying source for this tale about Arthur and the Slavs, as does H. van der Marel, ‘Op een tijt street dese Conine Artur ieghen die wilde wrede slauen die men nu Hollanders hiet.’ Koning Arthur in de laatmiddeleeuwse Hollandse kroniekschrijving’, in B. Ebels-Hoving, C. G. Santing and K.
It has been said that medieval origin stories, and specifically the Trojan myth, were generally meant for the rulers, and not for their people.²⁰⁹ The Dutch tradition, or at least that of Holland, may have been an exception to this rule: just as Jan Beke had intended his history to be that of a people, so too the story of Holland’s origins as presented in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ is a people’s, or a peoples’, history, in reality as well as intention. The chronicle described in detail how the region was populated by successive generations of Slavs:

This people, these Slavs, supported themselves in their livelihood by the sea and in the forest, and had many children, so that they dispersed, and a large part of them settled on the other side of the Meuse, in the place which is now called South Holland. The others migrated into Zealand, which was a large uninhabited island. And they used to support themselves by means of the sea, through fishing and piracy. Because of this, these people were called ‘Sea-landers’. The others, who lived in South Holland, were called the Wilts and sustained themselves with sheep, cows and horses.²¹⁰

As an indirect result of the dispersion of the Trojan princes, various peoples settled in Holland. They procreated and spread, supporting themselves by means of the natural resources available to them in the region; and they created for themselves a future which would eventually become a history.

The ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ also defines the Frisians much more clearly than Beke had done: the original inhabitants of the region, even before the Wilts and the Slavs, they were a people who stubbornly refused to accept the authority of the count when he encroached on their ancient liberties: ‘they refused to receive Count Dirk above the lord of East Francia, wanting instead to remain under the emperor’.²¹¹ The peoples of the

---

²⁰⁹ K. Tilmans, ‘Aeneas, Bato and Civilis, the Forefathers of the Dutch: The Origin of the Batavian Tradition in Dutch Humanistic Historiography’, in J. R. Brink and W. F. Gentrup (eds), Renaissance Culture in Context. Theory and Practice (Oxford, 1993), pp. 121-35, at 132, insists that in the early sixteenth century ‘for the first time in Dutch historiography a collective, historical identity was formulated which was valid for the Dutch natie, or people, as a whole. Before that time only the rulers, the counts of Holland, enjoyed famous ancestors’. This view is inconsistent with the evidence I present throughout this chapter.

²¹⁰ ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. a4r-v: ‘Dit volc dese slauen gheneerden hem ter zee ende in den woude, ende creghen veel kinder te samen, soe dat si hem stroyden, ende toghen een groet deel woenen ouer die maes dat nu zuythollant hiet. Die ander toghen in zeelant dat een groet onbewoent eylant was. Ende plaghien hem te gheneeren ter zee met vischen ende met rouwen. Dus worden die luden zeelanders gehieten. Die ander die in zuythollant woenden die hieten die wilten ende gheneerden hem met scapen mit coyen ende met paerden.’

²¹¹ Ibid., sig. v1v: ‘si en wouden graue direc niet ontfanghen ouer een heer van oest vrancrijc, mer si wouden onder den keyser bluyen’.
region either accepted the authority of princes or rejected their claims; and the story of this relationship between peoples and princes became one of the subjects of the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’.

In this chronicle, the people of Holland were given a history long before the establishment of the county, which had been the moment Beke had started speaking of Hollanders. Yet Beke’s implicit argument that the people of Holland’s true nature would only be fulfilled by their conversion to Christianity was made more explicit: ‘And in this way the land of Holland was first inhabited, but this people was still entirely heathen for more than 150 years afterwards, until St Willibrord came.’

After the history of Holland’s origin, which was added when the chronicle was first reworked, the remainder of the text is a succinct and rather dry retelling of the history of the counts of Holland following Beke, but omitting much of the anecdotal material. The chronicle reflects a raised awareness that throughout the course of its history, and especially recently, the status of the county of Holland as an independent entity had been diminished: several times its ‘coat of arms had come to nought’, first when the county fell to the count of Hainault in 1299, then to the duke of Bavaria in 1345, and finally to Duke Philip of Burgundy in 1433; but only in the section on Burgundy, added by later continuators, do international affairs truly become the subject of the chronicle. Even Utrecht, after initial episodes which clarify the division between the county and the diocese following the installation of Count Dirk I, disappears into the background.

On only one occasion is even a hint of doubt expressed as to the reliability of sources. This comes in the episode of the death of Count Willem II of Holland, who was secretly buried by the Frisians after he fell through the ice on his horse and was killed. The chronicle adds to the account, which otherwise follows Beke: ‘it is rather surprising that the people had let their lord advance so far ahead of them that he was killed and buried before they themselves reached the spot’. Not until one of the very last passages in the chronicle does the author of the final continuation express a heartfelt opinion about

---

212 Ibid., sig. a8v: ‘Ende in deser manier soe vorh dat lant van hollant eerst bewoent, mer dit volc wa noch al hayden noch meer dan anderhalf hondert iaer daer na tot dat sinte willibrort quam’. For Beke, see above, p. 38.

213 An exception to this is the story of the man whose productive cow was exchanged for a less productive one by the bailiff, ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sigs i8v-k2r, which is also told by Jan van Naaldwijk in his first chronicle, BL, MS Vitellius F xv, fol. 113r-v; see also below, Chapter 4, pp. 243 and 256, n. 1148.

214 ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. b4v, ‘ghinc die wapen van hollant te niet’; ibid., sigs k4v, m6r.

215 Ibid., sigs c5v-c6r.

216 Ibid., sig. f5r: ‘Mer dit was een wonderlic dinc dattet volc hoeren heer soe verre lieten voer riden alleen dat hi verslaghen ende begrauen was eer si daer toe quamen’.
current affairs: Duke Charles of Burgundy’s recent failures were not, as many thought, due to his opposition to the religious authorities, but instead to malicious counsel, specifically that given by Antoine Haneron and Jan de Leeuw, two powerful aristocrats.\(^{217}\)

The ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ was reprinted at least twice in the early 1480s.\(^{218}\) Its apparent popularity in both manuscript and print, combined with the lack of any direct printed rival, suggests that the chronicle was widely read. At least two historians in the late fifteenth century certainly drew on it for their chronicles.\(^{219}\) It is noteworthy, moreover, that in the second decade of the sixteenth century the *Divisiekroniek* incorporated an origin myth in which the recently identified ancient ancestors of the Hollanders, the Batavians,\(^{220}\) were seen, firstly, to have a direct political relationship to Rome, in line with Beke’s vision, and, secondly, to be free and without tribute, following the model established by the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’.\(^{221}\) Certainly, the precedent set by Beke and developed by the various authors who contributed to the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ had prepared the historical tradition of Holland for the adoption of the Batavian myth.\(^{222}\)

---

\(^{217}\) For Haneron and de Leeuw, see also W. Prevenier and W. Blockmans, *The Burgundian Netherlands* [Cambridge, etc., 1986], pp. 141, 248; *Divisiekroniek: Die cronycke van Hollant, Zeelant ende Vrieslant, beginnende van Adams tiden ...* (Leiden, 1517), fol. 361v (div. 30, cap. 88).

\(^{218}\) Leiden, 1483 (ISTC no. ic00484810) and Delft, between 1483 and 1486 (ISTC no. ic00484820).

\(^{219}\) Two historians who borrow material from the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ are the author of Veldener’s chronicles of Holland and Brabant (Janse, ‘Gelaagdheid’, pp. 150-51) and Johannes a Leydis (Marel, ‘“Op een tijt ...”’, p. 186).


\(^{221}\) See below, Chapter 3, pp. 190; Chapter 4, p. 250. Cf. above, pp. 36, 38, 47, 51 and 58 for the gradual development of this concept.

\(^{222}\) Although Tilmans, ‘Aeneas’, p. 124, makes the point that, already in the 15th century, historians had been searching for a suitable origin myth for the Hollanders, she does not mention the 14th-century precedent set by Jan Beke, nor does she observe the continuities between the proposed narratives in the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries.
Fig. 7: Alkmaar, Rijksarchief, MS 128 A 1, fol. 2r: Johannes a Leydis, chronicle of Holland, with early sixteenth-century interpolations

Image from Medieval Manuscripts in Dutch Collections (www.mmdc.nl).
In the second half of the fifteenth century, the Carmelite Johannes Gherbrandi a Leydis, initially a member of the monastery at Haarlem, later prior at Woudsend in Friesland and subsequently sub-prior at Haarlem, wrote three Latin chronicles: one about the lords of Brederode, written at the request of Reinoud van Brederode’s widow Jolande; another about the monastery of Egmond, written at the request of Abbot Nicolaas van Adrichem; and, finally, a chronicle of Holland. Johannes continued to revise his various chronicles, and he himself also produced a Dutch version of his Brederode chronicle. His work was part of a revival of Latin history writing by learned clerics in and about Holland, represented primarily by his own works and those of his contemporary, the priest Dirk Frankenszoon Pauw. The revised version of Leydis’s chronicle of Holland exerted a lasting influence on Dutch historiography via the Divisiekroniek, whose author relied on it for his information about the county.

Beke’s Chronographia was the primary source for Johannes a Leydis, as it had been for all previous historians of Holland. He says that he has used Beke’s work, and he borrows the opening of its introduction: ‘According to the Philosopher, the events of past times are certain signs of present or future ones’ (Fig. 7). His aim with his original chronicle, written in the 1460s, was to write a ‘chronicle of the Hollanders’; nevertheless, he did not exclude material concerning Utrecht from his account. Perhaps for this reason, in his revision of the chronicle, which he continued working on into the 1490s, he refers to it as a history of ‘the holy bishops of Utrecht and the magnanimous princes of Holland’. On the other hand, he organized his chronicle according to the lives of the counts, not of the bishops: most of the books into which he divided the work start with

---

223 The best account of his historical activities is Ebels-Hoving, ‘Johannes a Leydis’.

224 Pauli’s opus has been poorly studied. A summary of the available biographical information is provided in E. van der Werff, ‘Ad defendum terminos christianitatis. Het Liber bellorum dei van Theodericus Pauli (1489)’, in B. Ebels-Hoving, C. G. Santing and K. Tilmans (eds), Genoechliche ende lustige historiën. Laatmiddeleeuwse geschiedschrijving in Nederland (Hilversum, 1987), pp. 101-17, and references there at 102, n. 3. While a complete picture of late medieval historical writing about Holland needs to give a place to his works, I have chosen not to include them in the current study, not only due to their limited accessibility, but also because of their relatively limited impact on the other works discussed here. They were unknown to Jan van Naaldwijk.

225 Johannes a Leydis, Chronicon comitum Hollandiae et episcoporum Ultraictensium, in F. Sweertius (ed.), Rerum Belgicarum annales chronici et historici (Frankfurt, 1620), praefatio: ‘Gesta temporum praetertoriorum, teste Philosopho, certa sunt indicia praesentium, vel futurorum’. For Beke, see n. 93 above.


227 Leydis, Chronicon, praefatio: ‘sanctorum pontificum Traiectensium et magnanimorum principum Hollandiae’.
the succession of a new count and end with his death and burial. Only in the later part of the chronicle, which is independent from Beke’s _Chronographia_, is the focus more strictly limited to Holland, with a particular interest in Egmond; Utrecht gradually moves to the background.

Leydis was aware of international historiographical conventions, and he reorganized Beke’s text accordingly, beginning his chronicle, unlike the _Chronographia_, with a geographical description of Holland. He noted that the description of Holland provided by Beke, following Bartholomeus Anglicus, covered the larger region, including Utrecht. Leydis was keen to stress that while this was perhaps historically correct, it did not describe the present situation:

From this, it is clear that the diocese of Utrecht is also included under the name of ‘Holland’, not because it belongs to the county of Holland, but because Bartholomeus also clearly included the region of Utrecht under the name ‘Holland’, since he said that the capital city of Holland was called Utrecht (‘Trajectum inferius’). But if the previously mentioned Bartholomeus did not regard the diocese of Utrecht as a part of the region of Holland – because the county of Holland contains these four principal cities, in order of importance: Dordrecht, Haarlem, Delft, Leiden – then this does not seem to be true.229

After this addition, he narrates the early history of the region, largely following Beke’s chronicle.230

In some respects, however, Leydis’s chronicle differs from Beke’s. The most significant divergences are the greater attention paid by Leydis to the wider history of the surrounding principalities and his increased emphasis on the local nobility of Holland. For example, he adds to Beke’s account several chapters about the principalities of Flanders,231 Brabant and Lorraine,232 Guelders,233 and the counties of La Marck and

---

228 Ibid.: thus a series of books starting from lib. 6.
229 Ibid., p. 2 (6.1): ‘Ex his igitur patet, quod Dioecesis Traiectensis etiam includitur sub hoc vocabulo Hollandia, non quia de comitatu est Hollandiae, sed quia Bartholomaeus, ut patuit, terram Traiectensem etiam includit sub hoc vocabulo Hollandia, ex eo quod dixit capitalem Hollandiae civitatem nuncupari Traiectum Inferius, Sed hoc non videtur esse verum, si Bartholomeus praefatus non aestimaret Traiectensem dioecesin pro parte terrae Hollandiae, quia Comitatibus Hollandiae per se habet 4. civitates principiores, privilegiatas secundum istum ordinem, scilicet; Dordracum, Harlem, Delf, et Leyden.’
230 Ibid., lib. 1.
231 Ibid., pp. 54-5 (4.5); pp. 96-7 (6.8); p. 106 (7.15); pp. 127-8 (11.5); pp. 146-7 (16.4).
232 Ibid., pp. 117-18 (8.6); about Brabant alone pp. 11-12 (1.17); and about Lorraine alone p. 145 (16.2).
233 Ibid., pp. 126-7 (11.4).
Mons, as well as Cleves, Teysterbant, Hoesden, Altena and Baren. As for the local nobility, Leydis includes chapters on the lords and knights of Brederode, and on the origins of the lords of Lederdam, of Arkel and of other aristocratic families of Holland. He also regularly interrupts his narrative with lists of the most important members of the nobles of Holland during the period.

Leydis also concentrated on urban histories. Even before his accounts of the establishment of the church of Utrecht and the county of Holland, which are presented according to Beke’s narrative, he inserts a chapter about the foundation of Leiden, concluding with a laudatory poem. Leiden – probably his place of birth – was obviously a subject close to his heart, and the account he gives is remarkably detailed.

The regional towns and noble families therefore acquire, with Leydis’s chronicle, a firmly established place in the history of Holland. Although he provides detailed and comprehensive information on the surrounding principalities, Leydis does not appear to be entirely convinced of their significance for the history of Holland. Digressions concerning events not strictly related to the county are regularly concluded with remarks such as: ‘This is enough about the origin of Flanders; now let us return to our history.’ The inclusion of these chapters does, however, signal a new, and retrospective, awareness that the history of Holland had become a part of the history of the Burgundian Low Countries and that, therefore, the history of the other principalities in the Burgundian Low Countries was now part of the history of Holland.

Leydis also tapped into the amassed historical mythologies which had been added to the material available in Beke’s chronicle over the preceding century. He included, as the anonymous clerk had done before him, an account of the Trojan origins of the Franks. In Leydis’s account, however, the myth is not exclusively dynastic, but also concerns the history of the Frankish people. Nevertheless, Leydis also mentioned the Trojan

---

234 Ibid., pp. 147-8 (16.7).
235 Ibid., p. 62 (4.12).
236 The lords: ibid., pp. 113-14 (8.3); p. 122 (9.15); the knights: ibid., p. 193 (22.15).
237 Ibid., pp. 111-12 (7.27).
238 E.g., ibid., p. 123 (10.1): ‘Circa haec tempora viguerant et viguerunt in Hollandia nobiles ...’; p. 195 (22.18): ‘Porro circa haec tempora floruerunt in Hollandia et Zelandia plusquam quingenti milites, quorum maiores fuerunt ...’
239 Ibid., p. 7 (1.10).
241 Ibid., p. 5 (1.7).
ancestry of the Franks in a dynastic context, setting out the lineage from Priam of Troy, through the Merovingian kings, to the first count of Holland. The count was, therefore, something of a hybrid: he was a native of Holland, but at the same time had a noble foreign ancestry. While a Trojan lineage presumably conferred respectability on the count, his illustrious pedigree was also problematic: because he was not strictly indigenous, Dirk I was resisted by several local lords, including the castellan of Leiden, and his authority had to be established by repeated military interventions on the part of Charles the Bald. The county, in this chronicle, is again imposed from above, this time by means of the persistent use of force: ‘Thus, Lord Dirk persevered with violence and might, and he was made Count of Holland and Friesland, a newly created title.’

For Leydis, the difference between Friesland and Holland was geographically defined, as becomes clear in his passage about King ‘Donkey’s Ears’, who in earlier accounts had been referred to as a king of the Frisians. Leydis writes:

Aurindilius, who was mentioned before, was not yet king of Friesland, but king of Holland. ... [T]he previously mentioned kings, who were called [kings] of the Frisians, and their successors were accustomed to reside where they wished in the previously mentioned lands; and to obtain a guard and royal title according to the places in which they resided. So, those who resided in the Wilts’ Fortress were called kings of the Wilts’ Fortress; and those who resided in Friesland were called kings in Friesland. And those who resided in Holland were called kings of Holland; this King Donkey’s Ears was one of these.

From this passage, it appears that although there were geographically defined regions called Friesland and Holland, the peoples who lived there were not necessarily distinct, since they were ruled by one and the same king who took his title from his place of residence.

---

242 Ibid., p. 93 (6.1): ‘Porro hic egregius comes Hollandiae primus non solum extitit ingenuus, sed et exspectabilis genere, fuit enim de nobili prosapia Troianorum, antiquorum Regum Franciae, ortus.’

243 Ibid., p. 93 (6.2); p. 94 (6.3).

244 Ibid., p. 94 (6.3): ‘Sic igitur Satrapa Theodoricus cum violentia ac potentia permansit, et de novo creatus est Comes Hollandiae et Frisiae.’

245 Ibid., p. 8 (1.12): ‘hic habuit aures longas, ad instar asini’.

246 Ibid., p. 9 (1.12): ‘Itaque supradictus Arindalius nondum erat Rex Frisiae, sed Rex Hollandiae. ... reges praeediti, qui Frisonum sunt appellati, et eorum successores ad libitum consueverunt in terris praeeditis habitare, et praesidem, et nomen regium de locis, in quibus habitabant, sortiri. Unde qui habitabant in Wiltenborch, dicebantur Reges de Wiltenborch; et qui in Frisia, dicebantur Reges in Frisia. Qui vero in Hollandia habitabant, dicebantur Reges Hollandiae; de quibus iste Rex Ezeloer fuit unus.’
Yet from another passage, it becomes clear that the people of Holland had a history before the creation of the county, a history which was distinct from that of the Frisians. King Arthur’s conquest of the region, in this account, was partly successful – he managed to conquer the Frisians, but not the Hollanders. Following the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, Leydis writes: ‘This king at some time fought against the Hollanders, but could not defeat them. He therefore let them go on the condition that they must always obey his commands, and in this way they remained free without having to pay any tribute at all.’ Eventually, however, Holland was subdued by the Franks. In Leydis’s story, Holland is no longer presented as having first been a part of the Roman Empire in ancient times and then later incorporated into the Carolingian Empire, but rather as a Frankish conquest.

So, while in Beke’s version, the Hollanders were not mentioned before the creation of the county, over time the starting-point of their history had been pushed back several centuries. This process would be taken even further by the historians of the sixteenth century.

In addition to these larger narratives, Leydis adopted much of the rich store of anecdotes which had not been part of Beke’s Chronographia but which had accumulated in the historical tradition based on this chronicle: for example, the story of King Donkey’s Ears, and an account of the miracle of the prolific Countess Margaret of Hennenberg. Moreover, he inserted some entirely new material, such as the story of Roland and Oliver and the battle at Roncesvalles, and a short chapter about a local giant, Klaas van Kieten. Leydis was also more interested than Beke in ecclesiastical history not directly related to Utrecht. So, along with the information which Beke had taken from Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum for the early history of the church of Utrecht (that is, for the Anglo-Saxon missionaries), he included the conversion


248 Ibid., p. 11 (1.16): ‘Hollandenses autem hoc [i.e., a defeat of the Frisians by the Franks] videntes territi sunt, et idcirco festinabant foedus gratiae inire cum eodem rege. Quapropter terra Hollandiae, et quae modo dicitur Traiectensis dioecesis cum Wiltenborch addita est terrae Regis Franciae.’

249 For which see below, Chapter 2, pp. 155-158.

250 Leydis, Chronicon, pp. 217-18 (24.11); see further below, Chapter 2, pp. 126-129 and Chapter 4, pp. 226, 247, 249 and 256.

251 Leydis, Chronicon, pp. 71-2 (4.24).

252 Ibid., p. 233 (25.13).
of the Britons, following Geoffrey of Monmouth,\textsuperscript{253} which had happened long before that of the English and, indeed, long before the Anglo-Saxon invasion of Britain.\textsuperscript{254} While the author of the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ had turned to the stories of Geoffrey of Monmouth to supplement Beke’s account with a coherent and attractive history of origin of the people of Holland, Leydis’s use of this same material showed that it could also be appropriated for ecclesiastical history (even though its connection to Holland remains unclear).

\textsuperscript{253} Geoffrey of Monmouth, \textit{Historia regum Britannie}, lib. 4, § 72. There is no telling whether Leydis took the account from Geoffrey directly or through another source.

Fig. 8: Werner Rolevinck, *Fasciculus temporum*, showing different branches of history around the central time line

In 1474, a new type of chronicle, written by the Carthusian monk Werner Rolevinck, was first printed at Cologne.\footnote{Werner Rolevinck, Fasciculus temporum (Cologne, 1474) (Goff R253).} It was called the Fasciculus temporum, ‘a bundle of times’; and its layout, partly based on roll chronicles,\footnote{L. C. Ward, ‘Werner Rolevinck and the Fasciculus temporum. Carthusian Historiography in the Late Middle Ages’, in R. Suntrup and J. R. Veenstra (eds), Normative Zentrierung: Normative Centering (Frankfurt am Main, 2002), pp. 209-30.} suggested that history was something which was gathered together, a collection of disparate pieces of information, taken from different sources and concerning different times and different areas, which could be brought together into a varied whole. Traversing the middle of each page was a horizontal time line, with circles containing the names of the most important rulers (Fig. 8); the text was organized around this line, initially with events above it and commentary below, later with different ‘branches’ of history (e.g., Greek, Assyrian, Jewish) above and below the line, often with their own time lines.

The work was an immense success and went through at least seven reprints in Latin before the first vernacular translation was published in 1480:\footnote{The editions before 1480 are Goff R253-60. It was also disseminated in manuscript; see C. F. Bühler, ‘The Fasciculus Temporum and Morgan Manuscript 801’, Speculum 27 (1952), pp. 178-83 and J. C. Martens, ‘The Dating of the Fasciculus Temporum Manuscript in Arnhem Public Library’, Quaerendo 21 (1992), pp. 3-10.} a Dutch version printed in Utrecht by Jan Veldener,\footnote{Jan Veldener, Dat boec dat men hiet Fasciculus temporum (Utrecht, 1480) (Goff R278).} who had already brought out a Latin edition in Leuven in 1475.\footnote{Goff R256.} Veldener added to the main text a set of short chronicles of the different principalities of the lower Rhine delta – Flanders, Brabant, Utrecht, Holland, Guelders and Cleves – as well as of France and England. These chronicles confirm that, by the late fifteenth century, the history of Holland no longer had a closer connection to Utrecht than it did to the other territories in the region, whose histories were increasingly perceived as interrelated, sometimes converging, sometimes diverging over time.

The layout of the Latin Fasciculus temporum was maintained in the Dutch translation and in the short chronicles, which were traversed throughout by a horizontal time line. In the chronicles, however, the text ran from the top of the page to the bottom, often even filling the band which in the Fasciculus temporum was kept blank except for the circles containing the names of rulers. Consequently, the time line, which was an essential structural device in the Fasciculus temporum, became almost redundant and was apparently maintained solely for the sake of appearance. Nevertheless, Veldener’s short
chronicles still reflected an awareness that history was open-ended and had to be collected from different sources: occasionally, there are gaps where information was not (yet) available. So, for instance, the chronicle of Holland ends with a description of Maximilian of Habsburg and Mary of Burgundy, their son Philip, who was born in 1478, ‘and also a daughter who is called’ followed by a blank space. Margaret was born on 10 January 1480. By the time of printing (the colophon is dated 14 February), Veldener had learnt that the imperial couple had produced a daughter, but her name would have to be filled in by later readers.

Beke’s *Chronographia*, along with the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, served as sources for Veldener’s short chronicles, and their author reorganized the different elements available to him. The chronicle of Utrecht, which came before that of Holland, contains the pre-history of both. The origin myth of the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ was attached to the later history of the diocese rather than to that of the county. Juxtaposing the now separated histories of the different principalities in the region, it became even more pertinent to clear away the last remaining ambiguities concerning the place of Friesland within the early history of the region: ‘Friesland is vast and contains many lands, for there are many dioceses and duchies and counties which are now each separate principalities, governed well and honourably, which in former times were considered part of the province of Friesland and Lower Saxony.’ The chronicle then continues with the eviction of the Slavs from Britain and their separation into the Slavs and the Wilts, who, following the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, later become the peoples of Holland and Utrecht respectively. At this point, however, the chronicle turns into an ecclesiastical history of Utrecht.

---

261 Ibid., fol. 330r.
262 At least one reader added the name of Maximilian’s daughter (‘Margareta dalfinesse’), together with annalistic material at the ends of the chronicles of France and of Gelre; see British Library, shelfmark IB.47086, fols 216v, 217r, 321v.
264 The chronicles appear to have been written by one author, whose identity is uncertain. It is possible that Veldener himself played some part in their composition.
265 Veldener, *Fasciculus temporum*, fol. 244r: ‘Vrieslant is seer groot Ende daer is menicherhande landen in. want daer sijn veel bisdommen ende hertochdom ende greeschepen dat nv elke sonderlinghe goede ende eerbaer beheerde pijncelijken landen sijn die in ouden tijden inder provincien van vrieslant gherekent waren ende neder sassen’.
266 From ibid., fol. 249r.
The chronicle of Holland, separated from the history of the county’s origins, for which the author refers readers to the chronicles of Utrecht and England, was now an exclusively dynastic history (as it had essentially been in Beke’s *Chronographia*, despite his stated intentions). In this work, when read independently of the preceding chronicle of Utrecht, the history of Holland, unlike in Beke’s *Chronographia* or in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, truly commences with the grant of the county to Dirk. By this donation, the king ‘made Holland into a royal and princely county’. The letters confirming the grant, reproduced in full from Beke, establish the geographical limits of Holland, as well as the privileges and original possessions of its counts. The author has a stronger aversion than Beke to foreign encroachment on Holland’s sovereignty, explicitly defending the county against attempted usurpation by the emperor when one of the counts died childless: ‘that would be improper, for the county is always inherited by the closest living relative, since many counts and countesses have died childless, and it has always been inherited by the closest and oldest living relative.’

The author of Veldener’s chronicle of Holland resolved several ambiguities in the tradition with which he worked. As we have seen, in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ doubts were first expressed as to why he Willem II had been allowed to advance so far that his enemies could kill and bury him before his men caught up with him. This puzzle is solved here, and in a way that made the Frisians appear all the more ferocious: Willem had not been on his own, but all the men who were with him were brutally slaughtered. Just as the history of the origin of the county of Holland was given back to Utrecht, leaving the county with a purely dynastic rump history, starting with its creation under Dirk I, so too the history of Holland lost its ending: the chronicle concludes in 1433, when Philip the Good received the counties of Hainault, Holland and Zealand from Jacqueline of Bavaria. After this, the succession of Philip’s son Charles the Bold and the union of Maximilian of Habsburg and Mary of Burgundy are mentioned; but for their

---

267 Ibid., fol. 283r: ‘Vanden beghinne ende begrip van hollant hoe dat lant eerst bewoent ende begrepen wert vijntmen veel bescheyts of int beghinsel vander cronijcke van enghelant int CC ende xviij blat Ende oock mede int begin der cronijck van vtrecht int CC ende xliij blat.’

268 Ibid., fol. 283r-v: ‘Ende maecten van hollant een vorstelike ende princelike greefscap’.

269 Ibid., fol. 302r: ‘Mer dat en mocht nijt wesen want si erfift altoes op dat naeste lijff leuende aenghesien datter veel greuen ende oock greuinnen van hollant ghestoruen sijn sonder kinder Ende is altoes gheerfft op dat naeste lijff ende outste’.

270 See above, p. 60.

lives, the author says: ‘read the chronicle of Brabant, from folio 243 to the end’.  

The centralizing policies of the Burgundian dukes and their successors had produced a new impetus for the writing of regional chronicles; however, they also made it increasingly difficult to write the history of one principality in the region separately from that of the others. Beke’s ideal of political unity, although not quite as he had imagined it in his vision of the three stages of the region’s history, now approached fulfilment.

ACCESSING THE TRADITION OF HISTORY WRITING ABOUT HOLLAND AROUND 1500

Around 1500, the tradition of historical writing about Holland was available in various forms. The most accessible texts were, no doubt, the printed ones. Nonetheless, the unpublished *Chronographia* of Jan Beke – in Latin, French and Dutch – still had considerable dissemination in manuscript, as did several other texts based on it. At the beginning of the sixteenth century the financial value of manuscripts had decreased to the point that they were no longer marketable, but the manuscript transmission of texts continued to play a significant role in their distribution, perhaps particularly for historiographical texts, up to the middle of the sixteenth century and, as we shall see in Chapter 4, far beyond. Printing, however, increased the sheer quantity of available material in general, especially outside the institutional contexts of court and monastery; and it produced some significant new models for historiography, such as Robert Gaguin’s *De origine et gestis Francorum compendium* and the world chronicle of Hartmann Schedel. Humanist scholarship provided new access to ancient learning, including the historical works of Tacitus.

---

272 Veldener, *Fasciculus temporum*, fol 314r: ‘Van deses kaerls werken leset die cronijck van brabant int ij c.xxxxiiij. blat ten eynden toe wt.’


276 Chapter 4, pp. 233-235, 237-238, 257, 258; Figs 6, 32, 34 and 35.


The multiple editions of the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ appear to have satisfied the appetite for brief printed histories of Holland in Dutch well into the first decades of the sixteenth century. No attempt was made to produce a similar chronicle which might compete with it – the single exception was the set of regional chronicles of the Low Countries appended to Jan Veldener’s Dutch edition of the *Fasciculus temporum*, a much broader historical work which had already proved popular and marketable in Latin. Together the two books saturated the market, and the only attempt to find a new opening for a vernacular history of Holland, the *Divisiekroniek* of 1517, appears to have been a severe financial liability for its printer. The *Divisiekroniek* did not become a catalyst for comparable historiographical works; it was instead a warning to printers against embarking on similar attempts to popularize history writing in Dutch. But before the *Divisiekroniek* was published, the son of a nobleman from Holland set out to write another chronicle of the county, drawing on information which he had ‘mostly taken from a book made by one named Jan Beke’.

---


280 Tilmans, *Historiography*, p. 153, argues that ‘the publication of the Divisiekroniek acted as a catalyst ... . Printers soon realized that there was a market for specialized, humanist and especially short histories.’ But if the *Divisiekroniek*, which was neither short nor specialized, acted as a catalyst, it was only by providing a negative example; see also Tilmans, *Historiography*, pp. 108-9; J. Gerritsen, ‘Jan Seversz prints a Chronicle’, *Quaerendo* 21 (1992), pp. 99-124. It did, however, inform other types of historical writing; see below, Chapter 4, pp. 223-224, 230, 233, 234, 237, 241, 247, 257-259.

281 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol 2v: ‘meest ghenomen wt een boeck ghemaect bij enen johannes van [...]eke ghenoemt’.
Chapter 2

‘Ghenomen, vergadert ende ghetranslateert ende ouergheset’

‘Taken, collected, translated and transferred’
– Jan van Naaldwijk’s First Chronicle of Holland

Fig. 9: London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 19v: Jan van Naaldwijk, first chronicle of Holland, frontispiece

©The British Library Board. All rights reserved.
Reproduced with financial support of the University of London Central Research Fund.
INTRODUCTION

Jan van Naaldwijk’s First Chronicle of Holland

[I] had the desire to write [about Holland, and] who were its counts, princes, and [rulers] and how and in what manner they first acquired Holland and how it was first called Holland. And in it I will also treat [of the] bishops of Utrecht as far as it will [pertain] to the matter and subject.

– Jan van Naaldwijk, first chronicle of Holland, prologue

The unique copy of Jan van Naaldwijk’s first chronicle of Holland is preserved in an autograph manuscript: British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv. Although written in an informal hand, the book is a finished product, presenting a completed version of the author’s considered plan for an account of the history of the county of Holland. The manuscript was severely damaged in the Ashburnham House fire of 1731, leading to loss of text at the top corner of every page at the side of the original binding; about eight percent of the text is irretrievably lost, but enough is preserved to make sense of the chronicle, even if particular details occasionally remain uncertain.

The first pages of the codex contain preliminary matter written after the chronicle was completed: the author’s introduction, followed by a table of contents and a list of sources. After this a full-page image, the first of five illustrations in the manuscript, introduces the text of the chronicle. Following a description of the region, the chronicle commences with the history of Holland from the time of the fall of Troy. It then proceeds chronologically – apart from a number of digressions which will be discussed below – to survey the history of the county until Jan’s own day. The last recorded event in the chronicle is dated March 1514; the final pages of the chronicle were written before the summer of that year.

282 London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r-v: ‘... die sinne ghehad om te bescriue[......]a[...]t wije dat die grauen princhen ende [......] van zijn gheweest Ende hoe ende in wat m[......] sij eerst an hollant sijn ghecomen ende hoe dattet [...]t is ghenoemt Ende oek sal jck daer in roeren [...]scoppen van vtrecht alst totter materijen ende ten pro[...] sal’. A transcription of the manuscript is presented in Documentary Appendix 2.

283 The manuscript was rebound in oblong format along the bottom edge of the written page. For the fire and the subsequent restoration of the library, see A. Prescott, “Their Present Miserable State of Cremation”: The Restoration of the Cotton Library’, in C. J. Wright (ed.), Sir Robert Cotton as Collector: Essays on an Early Stuart Courtier and his Legacy (London, 1997), pp. 391-454.

284 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 371r. The chronicle ends mid-sentence at the end of the verso page, indicating that some text has been lost, but it cannot have been much: the last recorded event is also the
As Jan explains in his introduction, the work is, in essence, a chronicle of Holland and its counts, with additional information about other regions, principally Utrecht, when these pertain to the main subject. In this respect, it is an historical work in the tradition described in the previous chapter, built up around the established chronology and set of narratives which formed the core of the chronicles described there, and ordered according to the succession of lives of the counts. Its size, however, provides an indication that Jan expanded this tradition: covering more than 700 pages of continuous text, written over the full width of the folio pages of the manuscript, its length is quite exceptional for a regional chronicle. Totalling more than 300,000 words, it is, for example, almost twice as long as the most extensive Dutch version of Beke’s chronicle, Jan’s main source. This expansion is not due simply to an accumulation of new historical information since the 1420s, when the version of Beke’s chronicle used by Jan ended – which, in any case, is balanced by his omission of numerous passages from Beke – but, above all, to significant additions from other sources over the total length of the chronicle. Some of these belonged to the established canon of works about Holland’s history, such as the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’; but most of them Jan himself introduced as relevant to the historical tradition in which he positioned his work. Jan’s use of sources, then, seems to be the key to understanding his approach to the history of Holland. This suggestion is further confirmed by the emphasis which he himself placed on such matters in the initial pages of the work: not only the list of sources, but also the introduction and the frontispiece indicate that Jan saw his relation to his sources as central to his historiographical efforts.

Ibid., fol. 366v: ‘Item in dit selue jaer voerscreuen [i.e., 1513] heeft die pestelenci zeer gheregneert in hollant in sommighe steden ende dorpen als te delff ter goude in den haech te scijedam ende ter wateringen, brabant ende zeelant en is nijet al vrij geweest van deser plaghen Ic sorch wij den toecomenden zomer daer noch meer off vernemen sullen’. According to K. Tilmans, Historiography and Humanism in Holland in the Age of Erasmus: Aurelius and the Divisiekroniek of 1517 (Nieuwkoop, 1992), p. 90, ‘from Van Naaldwijk’s prologue we can see he completed his chronicle of Holland in 1514’; however, while the date is correct, there is no such indication in the prologue. Jan’s use of sources printed in 1512 (‘The Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’, see below, p. 92, n. 367) and possibly 1513 (Froissart’s chronicles, see below, p. 96) provide evidence of the speed with which he wrote his chronicle.

Jan Beke, Croniken van den stichte van Utrecht ende van Hollant, ed. H. Bruch (The Hague, 1982). It is also about twice the length of Die alder excellentie cronyke van Brabant, Hollant, Seelandt, Vlaenderen int generael, 1st edition (Antwerp, 1497). The Divisiekroniek (Die cronycke van Hollant, Zeelant ende Vrieslant, beghinnende van Adams tiden ... [Leiden, 1517]) is around double the size of Jan’s chronicle, indicating the scale of its expansions; on which see below, Chapter 3, pp. 163-169.
PART I

The Opening Pages of the Manuscript of
Jan van Naaldwijk’s First Chronicle of Holland

Fig. 10: Author portrait of Jan van Naaldwijk from
London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 19v

©The British Library Board. All rights reserved.
Reproduced with financial support of the University of London Central Research Fund.
Jan van Naaldwijk at work: an image and a description

Facing the opening page of Jan van Naaldwijk’s first chronicle of Holland is a frontispiece which the author himself drew and inserted into his manuscript (Fig. 9). In a circle at the top of the page, he depicted himself at work (Fig. 10). Sitting at a desk situated next to a large window, he writes on a page of an unbound quire, apparently copying material into his chronicle from a book which lies open on a lectern behind his desk. Various other books, both open and closed, lie around on the floor of his studio. On the side of his desk is the Naaldwijk family’s coat of arms: a shield of argent with a red lion rampant. The shield is surmounted by an inverted ducal coronet, an indication that the author’s family had lost possession of the estates to which its noble title was connected.

Although Jan may have prepared a draft copy of his chronicle before writing out this manuscript, the illustration can still be an accurate depiction of the way he produced the codex: there are indications that he continued revising the text, and adding material from various sources, while perhaps copying from a draft. Yet the image is traditional in its portrayal of the compiler’s craft and, therefore, was not necessarily meant to depict Jan’s own study. Instead, it was a means to present himself as a compiler, working from a range of sources. The desk next to the largest window in the room, the unbound page and the volume on a bookstand are all conventional symbols in portraits of authors and scribes.

287 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 19v. It is on the verso of a blank page immediately preceding the opening paragraphs of the chronicle; the fact that the recto side is blank suggests the page was inserted when Jan put the finishing touches to the manuscript. He reserved space in his text for the other four images (fols 25r, 49r, 54v and 165v), which confirms that they were part of his design for the chronicle. The crude quality of the illustrations suggests that they were not the work of a professional artist but instead produced by Jan himself, though it is impossible to prove this for certain. See also below, n. 426.


289 While the consistency of the handwriting and the complexity of the chronicle make it unlikely that the autograph was in fact Jan’s working copy, there are occasions when changes in the script coincide with changes of source; these are particularly significant when the change does not coincide with other forms of textual division (such as paragraph marks), e.g., fol. 101r, shift from Beke, Croniken, p. 159 (cap. 74) to ‘Chronicle of Gouda’: Die cronike of die hystorie van Hollant van Zeelant ende Vrieslant ende van den sticht van Utrecht (Gouda, 1478), sig. h4v; fols 139r-v, where material taken from Jean Froissart, Chroniques de France, 4 vols (Paris, 1513), I, fols 24r and 77r is brought together. Other signs are: the inserted leaf fol. 330r-v, which adds information to the surrounding pages in the chronologically appropriate place, but interrupts both the sequence of Jan’s foliation and the sentence which starts at fol. 329v and continues on fol. 331r; the deleted sentence at the end of fol. 202r, where a planned addition to Jan’s source (it is placed between texts from Beke, Croniken, §12 and §13) was apparently reconsidered.
the open and closed books on the floor are particularly common in those of compilers.\footnote{C. Meier, ‘Ecce auctor. Beiträge zur Ikonographie literarischer Urheberschaft im Mittelalter’, \textit{Frühmittelalterliche Studien} 34 (2000), pp. 338-92, at 351-3, and plates 27-111, at 38-41.}

A very similar, if more elegant and elaborate, execution of the same scheme is found, for example, in a miniature, a little over half a century older, depicting the Burgundian courtier, ducal secretary, translator and compiler Jean Miélot at work (Fig. 11).\footnote{Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek/Bibliothèque Nationale, MS 9278-80, fol. 10r; image from C. de Hamel, \textit{Scribes and Illuminators} (Toronto, 1992). For a description of the manuscript, a presentation copy for Duke Philip the Good of Burgundy produced c. 1450, see A. J. Vanderjagt, \textit{Qui sa vertu anoblist. The Concepts of noblesse and chose publicque in Burgundian Political Thought} (Groningen, 1981), pp. 108-09.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{image11.png}
\caption{Author portrait of Jean Miélot, from Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek/Bibliothèque Nationale, MS 9278-80, fol. 10r}
\end{figure}

\footnotetext{Fig. 11: Author portrait of Jean Miélot, from Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek/Bibliothèque Nationale, MS 9278-80, fol. 10r. Image from C. De Hamel, \textit{Scribes and Illuminators} (Toronto, 1992).}

The coat of arms is the sole personalizing and distinguishing symbol which identifies the central figure as Jan van Naaldwijk. The portrait of himself as a compiler corresponds to the account of his activities in the prologue which he appended to his chronicle after completing it and in which he reflected on how he had set about writing the work.\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r-v.}

There, as we saw in the previous chapter, he wrote: ‘I compiled, collected, translated and adapted into Dutch this history, \textit{gest} and chronicle from many French and Latin books and authors.’\footnote{Ibid., fol. 2r: ‘jc ... heb dese historie ijeste ende cronijck ghenoemen vergadert ende ghetranslateert ende ouergheset wt den walschen ende latijnen in duijtsche wt voel boecken ende autoeren’. See above, Chapter 1, p. 21, n. 36.}
Such a description of the historian’s craft as a compilatory activity was common throughout the Middle Ages; but Jan’s prologue otherwise was far from conventional. Medieval historians, in their introductions, habitually referred to the many people (or specific individuals) who had implored them to write the work, dedicated it to (potential) patrons or gave philosophical justifications for the writing of history – preferably a combination of all three. But in his prologue, Jan, defying historiographical convention, did not provide any reasons for undertaking the task, apart from his own desire, ‘die sinne’, to do so. He also gave little indication of an intended, or even an imagined, readership. Only in his express wish – and here Jan did follow convention – that his text would be ‘corrected by those who know it better’ is there an indication that he did not mean his manuscript to remain unread by others.

Apart from this, however, Jan, shunning tradition, focused solely on the difficulties he had encountered when preparing to write his chronicle. He bemoaned the fact that he had not been able to obtain all the relevant sources for the history of Holland, in particular from the humanist circle of Erasmus. Jan believed that an as yet unpublished chronicle of Holland had been written by Willem Hermans of Gouda (Wilhelmus Hermannus Goudanus), a canon at the monastery of Stein and a friend and former colleague of Erasmus. He explained that he had delayed writing a chronicle of Holland for a considerable period while waiting to get hold of Hermans’s work. When, however, the chances of it ever becoming available appeared slim, he had decided to go ahead anyway.

294 E.g., Die alder excellenste cronyke van Brabant, Hollant, Seelandt, Vlaenderen int generael, 2nd edition (Antwerp, 1512), sig. a3r: ‘die compositoer dees boecks ... heeft dese Cronike getrocken uut vele ander autentike boecken’.
296 E.g., ‘Kattendijck Chronicle’, p. 4 (prologue): ‘Nu bid ic alle die dit boeck lesen dat si mijn crancheit aensient, want het uut veel boecken vergadert is. Ende ist datter ict incorrect is, so bid ic dat sijt hoesselic corregieren om Gods willen, want wij alle ghebrekel sijn’. Again, Geoffrey of Monmouth, Historia regum Britanniae, p. 281 (§ 208) subverts this convention when he urges other historians not to correct his work.
297 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r: ‘tot correxien der gheenre dijet beter weten’.
and write his chronicle to the best of his ability, based on the sources that were accessible to him.

Jan suspected that Hermans’s inability to find financial support was the reason why his chronicle remained unpublished. In his description of Hermans’s efforts to secure financial backing for the printing of his chronicle, Jan at first sight appears well informed about the contingencies of producing texts for the printing press, although he gives no hint of seeking publication (or patronage) himself. He also seems well acquainted with the circle of humanists surrounding and inspired by Erasmus, yet he clearly had only limited access to the intellectual environment of Northern humanism. He prides himself on the fact that he once was in Paris at the same time as Erasmus, but he does not mention a personal encounter or any closer proximity; and his information about the literary activities of Hermans seems to have been inaccurate. His comments in the introduction to his chronicle are an expression of unfulfilled desire rather than a portrayal of reality: they sketch the context in which he would have liked to see his own work and emphasize his wish to establish a connection between his own historiographical project and the intellectual endeavours of Erasmus and his friends in the Dutch Low Countries.


300 There is no evidence to support the general assumption that Jan wrote his chronicle with the aim of having it published (e.g., Ebels-Hoving, ‘Nederlandse geschiedschrijving’, p. 232, n. 63; R. Fruin, ‘De samensteller van de zoogenaamde Divisie-Kroniek’, Handelingen en mededeelingen van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde [1889], pp. 114-22, at 114; Tilmans, Historiography, p. 90). The introduction of printing did not end the production, dissemination and consumption of historical information in manuscript; see also below, Chapter 4, pp. 233-235, 237-238, 257, 258.

301 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r: ‘Dese wilhelmus heeft veel boecken ghemaect ende laten drucken die hij ghescreuen heeft ter eren herasmum voerghenoemt (doen herasmus te parijs woende ende ic oeck daer jese ghesijen ende ghelesen hebbe)’. Erasmus had arranged for the publication of Hermans’s Silva odarum (Paris, 1497), which also includes a prefatory letter by Robert Gaguin.

Jan van Naaldwijk’s List of Sources

Jan’s aspirations to participate in the humanist intellectual programme may have inspired him to introduce an innovation in the front-matter of his chronicle. Immediately preceding the frontispiece and the beginning of the chronicle, he included a list of the works which he claimed to have used in compiling his history.\textsuperscript{303} Such lists of sources or cited authorities are a regular occurrence in erudite books of the period;\textsuperscript{304} but they are rare in vernacular texts, where authors are more often mentioned (if at all) in the prologue or in the text itself.\textsuperscript{305} Allusions to ‘authorities’ in texts of this sort are generally interpreted as a means of enhancing a work’s academic credentials in light of the supposedly lower status of the vernacular as compared to Latin.\textsuperscript{306} But Jan’s list may have been more directly related to his concern to show that his efforts were not inferior to those of the humanists and, in particular, to ‘the great labours which Willem Hermans had devoted’ to his history, since he

had to travel to many places, cities, fortresses, castles and villages to investigate and to see whether he might somewhere find new and distinctive source materials, serving as argument to honour, commend, praise and dignify the princes, the counts and the house of Holland.\textsuperscript{307}

The printing press and Northern humanism (as well as the dissemination of Italian humanist texts north of the Alps) can, in fact, be credited with creating the intellectual and material environment in which Jan’s project became possible. Perhaps the main

\textsuperscript{303} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 18r-v: ‘[…….] van den autoeren die Ic […….] ghenwoerdighe cronijck alzo […….] sch ende duijts […….] erst den ghenen daer je wt ouergheset hebbe wt […….] ende latijnen in duijts’. See Documentary Appendix 1.

\textsuperscript{304} E.g., Angelo Poliziano, Miscellaneorum centuria prima (1\textsuperscript{st} ed. 1489), in his Opera (Basel, 1553), pp. 213-311, at 218-19, where the organization is by branch of knowledge, whereas Jan’s is by language (see p. 84 below, and Documentary Appendix 1). Such lists were different from indices, which aimed instead to facilitate systematic consultation of the text; on the development of systematic ‘hypertexts’ in medieval manuscripts, including glosses and indices, see M. B. Parkes, ‘Folia librorum quaerere: Medieval Experience of the Problems of Hypertext and the Index’, in C. Leonardi et al. (eds), Fabula in tabula: Una storia degli indici dal manoscritto al testo elettronico (Spoleto, 1995), pp. 23-42.

\textsuperscript{305} The author of the ‘Kattendijke Chronicle’ (see below, p. 84), p. 4, mentions only ‘veel boecken’ (in fact, there were seven). The author of the Divisiekronek refers to twenty-two authors in his prologue (Divisiekronek, prologue, fol. b.v; cf. Tilmans, Historiography, pp. 157-9), and several more throughout the chronicle (ibid., pp. 179-93), but he does not provide a separate list. Such lists are, however, found in many later chronicles, e.g., The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 78 C 23 (chronicle of West Friesland, seventeenth century), fol. 7r-v; L. van Haecht Godtsenhoven, Chronicke van de hertoghen van Brabant (Antwerp, 1606), sig. *3v.

\textsuperscript{306} E.g., Tilmans, Historiography, p. 182.

\textsuperscript{307} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r: ‘sijnen groten arbeid die hij daerom ghedaen hadde ende verteert Want hij heeft sonder twiel moeten reijsen in menighe plaetsen steden sloten castelen ende dorpen om te besijen ende te ondersoecken off hij erghens wat nieuwes ende sonderlinkxs soude vinden ter materijen ende ten propoeste dijenede tot eer loff prijs ende hoecheijt der princhen grauen ende huijse van hollant’.
differences between his chronicle and what can in some ways be considered its older cousin, the ‘Kattendijke Chronicle’, a similarly individual vernacular chronicle written a generation earlier, are the sheer number of sources which were available to Jan, his ease in handling texts in different languages and the importance he attaches to both. The author of the earlier chronicle had had to make do with just seven sources, three of them in manuscript and all written in Dutch. Jan, by his own account, used thirty-six sources, in Latin and French, as well as Dutch. In the past, only monastic historians had had access to more than a handful of sources; by the time Jan set about compiling his list, this situation had changed radically.

In the list the sources are subdivided by language: Latin (twenty-four), French (five) and Dutch (seven). Some of the references are rather vague (‘noch andere ghedichten ende priuilegijen’ – ‘and other poems and charters’), but most are clearly identified by author and title. Apart from the breakdown by language, there appears to be no other organizing principle: the titles are not listed strictly in the order in which they first occur in the chronicle, nor according to their apparent significance as historical sources; they are not grouped by genre nor alphabetized by title.

The most immediately striking characteristic of the list is the preponderance of sources available in print at the time that Jan was writing. Of the works that are identifiable by title, only two were definitely unavailable in print when he wrote his chronicle. Half of

---


310 Jan used about twenty-five sources first hand, see Documentary Appendix 1. The change, while radical, was much more gradual than Tilmans suggests (Historiography, p. 83); the fact that historians before 1500, like Johannes a Leydis, ‘had no contact with printing houses, nor indeed ... sought any such contact’, does not preclude the possibility that they consumers of printed works; Leydis, for example, may well have read Antoninus’s chronicle in print (Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 41, fols 338r-341r, contains his response to that work).

311 E.g., Documentary Appendix 1, titles 11 (Poggio, epistles), 12 (Biondo, Decades) and 13 (Bergomensis, Supplementum) occur in the chronicle in reverse order, fols 220r, 78v and 77r respectively.

312 I.e., the ‘Dutch Beke’ and the Defensorium Beatae Virginis Mariae. The first edition of Willem Hermans’s Olandie Gelrieque bellum (title 19 in Documentary Appendix 1) is generally dated c. 1517, which would indicate that Jan read it in manuscript; the dating, however, is based on erroneous grounds, and Jan refers to Hermans’s works as printed; see below, Chapter 3, p. 176. There are further unprinted
the sources Jan mentions were written in the previous century, and their dissemination can be seen as primarily a product of the printing press. Ten of the remaining works are medieval – the rest are from classical antiquity, and, as we shall see below, he did not actually consult these first-hand. Most of the titles listed by Jan are historical: the largest portion, thirteen of the thirty-six sources on his list are histories and chronicles; a further eight are biographical works. There are four collections of exempla or anecdotes, three itineraries, one ethnography and two geographical descriptiones.

Chroniclers of Holland were reluctant to rely on an appeal to authority, even Jan Beke, whose chronicle had become the foundational text of a local tradition, was not always mentioned by the historians who drew on his work. Seen against this background, Jan’s explicit preoccupation with his sources becomes all the more remarkable. His inability to gain access to certain works, and his reliance on others, was, as we have seen, the central focus of his introduction; his list of sources called attention to the wide variety of texts he (claimed to have) consulted; and, finally, throughout the chronicle, he repeatedly mentions the sources on which he bases his information.

sources, such as Margaret’s privilege (see below, pp. 135-137) and one or more written sources from Loosduinen (pp. 126-129).

313 Documentary Appendix 1, titles 7, 10-13, 15, 17-20, 24-5, 27-9, 31, 35 and 36.
314 Ibid., titles 6, 8, 9, 16, 23, 26, 30, 32-4.
315 Ibid., titles 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 24, 26, 30, 31 and 36.
316 Ibid., titles 1-4, 18, 20, 28, 29 and 34.
317 Ibid., titles 8, 20, 23 and 25.
318 Ibid., titles 16, 32 and 35.
319 Ibid., titles 27; 6 and 7 respectively.
320 Only the Speculum historiale of Vincent of Beauvais, partly due to its translation by Jacob van Maerlant, was venerated; but this text had very little to offer as a source for the history of Holland.
321 Beke is not mentioned, e.g., by Claes Heynenzoon (cf. Verbij-Schillings, Beeldvorming, p. 62), in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, or in the local chronicles in Veldener’s Fasciculus temporum.
PART II

The Textual Sources of
Jan van Naaldwijk’s First Chronicle of Holland

Through his use of his sources Jan van Naaldwijk continued the process of accumulative growth, ultimately based on the chronicle of Jan Beke, which characterized the historical tradition of Holland. But he also expanded that tradition in several new directions, possibly more radically than any chronicler had done before him – previous chroniclers of Holland had more often limited Beke’s scope than expanded it. Through an analysis of the works on his bookshelf and the various ways he made use of them, we can come to an understanding of Jan van Naaldwijk as a chronicler of Holland’s history.322

THE HISTORICAL CANON OF HOLLAND

Jan Beke, Chronographia, Dutch translation and continuation (‘Dutch Beke’)323

From the outset, Jan made clear that, while other sources had been important to him, ‘the text of the chronicle and the counts of Holland I have mostly taken from a book made by one named Johannes van Beke’.324 Beke’s chronicle is listed under the Dutch sources, since Jan consulted a manuscript of the Dutch translation.325 He often mentions the work

322 While it is impossible to entirely rule out the possibility of intermediary versions which no longer survive, the weight of evidence indicates that Jan was perfectly capable of consulting sources in Latin and French, and translated from them himself. I have found instances of him copying references from his other sources, but none where he used a text in a language other than the one indicated in his list of sources.

323 Documentary Appendix 1, title 30: ‘Johannes van der beke sijn cr[...] van den biscoppen van vtrecht [...]’.

324 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r: ‘den rechten text van die cronijck ende grauen van hollant heb je meest ghenomen wt een boeck ghemaect bij enen johannes van [...]eke ghenoemt’.

325 Jan’s use of the ‘Dutch Beke’ ends at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 256v, with Beke, Croniken, p. 385 (§67). He had a manuscript similar to (or identical with) J1, The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 130 C 10 (Fig. 2; see Beke, Croniken, pp. xliii-xliv [Bruch’s introduction] for a description; it is the witness for branch J of the stemma), for the original part of the ‘Dutch Beke’, as attested by omissions (e.g., Beke, Croniken, p. 86 [cap. 55] ‘mit allen sinen hulpers’, omission shared with JK, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 36r), variants (e.g., ibid., fol. 39v, erroneous ‘bedroefde’, agreeing with J, p. 93 [cap. 56]), and chapter headings (e.g., fol. 41v, agreeing with J, p. 98 [cap. 59]; and fol. 134r, agreeing with J, p. 185 [cap. 81]).
in his chronicle, mostly on occasions where he returns to it after drawing on a different source or vice versa, or where he notes that other works disagreed with Beke’s version of events. He by no means marked every occasion with a reference, however; and his use of Beke’s chronicle was irregular: sometimes he copied long stretches of the text almost verbatim, but elsewhere he conflated the accounts of several sources, often without indicating the discrepancies between them, or even mentioning all the works on which he was drawing.

Jan’s chronicle was, therefore, a traditional product of the historical tradition of Holland, in which Beke’s chronicle, either in the Latin original or the Dutch translation, was the principal source of information, as well as providing the chronological framework for later insertions and additions, and only to be altered with restraint. For Jan, as for earlier historians, Beke’s account of events was, in general, preferred to those found in later histories (for instance, the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ or the local chronicles in Veldener’s Dutch *Fasciculus temporum*). Nevertheless, Beke’s authority was not always unchallenged. Moreover, Jan allowed himself considerable freedom with the language and details of Beke’s chronicle – the passages he takes from it contain far more variants than are found in any manuscripts of the ‘Dutch Beke’.

Such variants range from small changes of vocabulary to alterations which affect the significance of entire passages. The minor variants are, for the most part, of no apparent

---

326 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 31r, 32r, 37v, 48v, 51r, 188v, 215r, 245v.
327 E.g., ibid., fols 48v, 215r.
328 E.g., ibid., fols 32r, 37v.
329 E.g., ibid., fols 33v-36v, 37v-46r.
330 E.g., ibid., fols 26v-28r, 30r-31r, 68r-69v.
331 E.g., ibid., fol. 51r.
332 The consistency in vocabulary and grammar between ‘Dutch Beke’ manuscripts even a century apart is striking: see Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 29-34, for full transcriptions of a single chapter from all manuscripts (cap. 23, unfortunately omitted by Jan).
consequence.333 Some, found in passages which are otherwise copied verbatim, were clearly suggested by Jan’s other sources.334 Others, however, reflect his own character as a writer. Certain of these changes may have been inspired by a desire to make the narrative more attractive, either by the insertion of emotive words or by providing more detail. Through the insertion of a single word, Jan suggests that a magical event seemed to have been carried out by demons;335 he says of an army that it acted like a pack of wolves;336 a protagonist feels not merely ‘envy’, but ‘sorrow, envy and hate’;337 he adds squealing horns and playing flutes to blowing trumpets and beating drums;338 and he changes indirect into direct speech.339

Jan clearly liked to insert certain words, the most important of which are ‘rebel’340 and ‘ketter’341 (‘heretic’) and their derivative forms, reflecting, as we shall see, particular interests of his. Other minor, but systematic, additions concern the ever-expanding titles of the counts of Holland: when his source referred simply to the ‘Counts of Holland’, Jan often either supplied the lord’s principal title or omitted ‘Holland’ altogether. Thus, early in the chronicle, he makes a point of adding Zealand to Holland,342 then (East) Friesland to Holland and Zealand,343 later, he joins Hainault to Holland,344 and eventually the

333 E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 30v, ‘Ende hijer teghen is ghecomen’, Beke, Croniken, p. 63 (cap. 44), ‘Ende daer teghen quam’; in addition, Jan usually prefers vernacular and modern orthography for names and occasionally paraphrases in order to avoid archaisms.

334 E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 25v: the text is taken from Beke, Croniken, p. 43 (cap. 29), but it shares two variants (‘brijeff’ for ‘lettere’; ‘prinche’ for ‘manne’) with Jan Veldener, Dat boec dat men hiet Fasciculus temporum (Utrecht, 1480), fol. 283v.

335 E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 56v, ‘oft een aﬄs bedroch gheweest hadd[. ]’ (my emphasis), for Beke, Croniken, p. 127 (cap. 66), ‘oft een droch gheweest hadde’.

336 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 43v, adds to Beke, Croniken, p. 103 (cap. 59): ‘seusche woluen’.


338 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 45v, adds to Beke, Croniken, p. 110 (cap. 63) (major additions in italics): ‘Die heer van goer die sunte mertijns banner droech dede die trompetten [Beke: basunen] blasen ende die metalen hoernen snerken die bommen slaen ende die flijiten spelen’.

339 E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 48r, ‘Die bisscop was zeer verwondert van roeloff [ . . . ] ende seijde Waerom sijt ghij doch aldus stout dat ghij met een [ . . . ]cht alleen dort comen onder v alre meeste vianden’, taken from Beke, Croniken, p. 114 (cap. 64), ‘Die bisscop, dien sere verwonderde van des Roelofs comen, vraghede hem aldus, waerom hi also coene ware dat hi mit enen knechte allene dortre comen onder alle sine meeste viande’.


342 E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 35r, ‘ende Zeelant’, added to Beke, Croniken, p. 80 (cap. 53).

343 E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 44v, ‘ende Zeelant ende oeck Oestvrieslant’, added to Beke, Croniken, p. 107 (cap. 62).
‘Dukes of Holland’ become the ‘Dukes of Bavaria’. These minute changes are typical of the way he approached the history of Holland, and they went hand-in-hand with larger structural decisions – explored further below – which he made when compiling his chronicle, as he expanded the concept of a history of Holland to include not only the exploits of the county’s lords in their various domains but also important events, especially those concerning schisms, heresies and popular revolts, as well as entertaining stories from all over Europe and the rest of the world.

Jan’s main departure from the ‘Dutch Beke’ is his omission of most of its material about the diocese of Utrecht. This aspect of his chronicle is also reminiscent of several earlier adaptations of Beke’s work, as discussed in the previous chapter. It is mainly due to the fact that he was writing a chronicle of Holland, not Utrecht, although it may also have been inspired by a wish to portray the history of Utrecht as subservient, or even irrelevant, to that of Holland. Jan expanded on Beke’s history by including information from various sources; and, like other chroniclers of Holland before him, the first place he went looking for such additional material was in the chronicles belonging to the historical tradition of Holland.

**‘Several printed chronicles’ and the *Fasciculus temporum***

Thus, Jan drew on the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ and the chronicles of the principalities of the Dutch Low Countries which were included in Jan Veldener’s edition of the Dutch translation of the *Fasciculus temporum*. They are probably the ‘several printed chronicles’ he listed among his Dutch sources. The *Fasciculus temporum* appears
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344 E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 165v, ‘ende henegouwen’, added to Beke, *Croniken*, p. 192 (cap. 82).
346 In the original chronicle, the histories of Holland and of Utrecht were combined but still remained relatively distinct since they were mostly treated in separate chapters. In the continuations, however, such distinctions were not as evident. Accordingly, in contrast to the earlier part of his chronicle, Jan made little attempt to distinguish between the histories of Holland and Utrecht in his account of this later period, taking over almost the complete text of the Dutch continuation.
347 See also below, p. 116.
348 Documentary Appendix 1, title 31: ‘Sommighe gheprente cronijcken’.
349 Ibid., title 24: ‘Fasciculus temporum’.
350 E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 66v, from Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 140-41 (cap. 69) and ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. f6r.; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 257v, from *Alder excellenste cronyke van Brabant*, sigs aa6r-bb1r, ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. m5r-v, and Veldener, *Fasciculus temporum* (Chronicle of Holland), fol. 313v.
351 Documentary Appendix 1, title 31: ‘Sommighe gheprente cronijcken’.
separately among Jan’s Latin sources. He listed other sources which he read in translation under the language into which they were translated, even when he was aware of their original language, nevertheless, it is not clear whether he used the Latin *Fasciculus temporum* as well as the Dutch version printed by Jan Veldener; most mentions of the *Fasciculus* in Jan’s text clearly refer to Veldener’s Dutch edition and the accompanying regional chronicles of the Dutch Low Countries.

Beke’s account of the earliest history of the region was mainly concerned with Utrecht. Jan excised this material, preferring the account of the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ and other sources, as well adding material of his own. The historical canon of Holland presented no clear model for the opening structure of a chronicle. While the ‘Dutch Beke’ provided an extensive pre-history before giving a *descriptio* of the region, the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ had no such *descriptio* and commenced instead with the Trojan myth. Jan, probably following the convention established by the histories of Orosius and the Venerable Bede and used in many chronicles from the wider European historiographical tradition, started his chronicle with a geographical description of the region, in effect, placing the pre-existence of Holland before its history proper commenced (unlike the chronicles of Beke and Claes Heynenzoon, where the *descriptio* was strategically placed to emphasize particular aspects of the early history of the region). He took this *descriptio* from the ‘Dutch Beke’ and copied the reference there to the source, Bartholomeus Anglicus’s *De proprietatibus rerum*, which he also included in his list of sources. After the *descriptio*, however, Jan turned to the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, with added details from the chronicle of England in Veldener’s Dutch *Fasciculus temporum*, which provided the basis for a more elaborate pre-history of the county.

Jan takes his origin myth, not from Beke’s work, but instead from the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, starting with the fall of Troy, leading to the expulsion of the giants from the

---

352 E.g., Poggio Bracciolini’s *Facetiae*, used in translation and listed among his French sources; see below, pp. 141-142.


354 See above, Chapter 1, p. 35, n. 106. Dutch examples which may have inspired Jan to adopt this arrangement are *Alder excellenste cronyke van Brabant*, sig. a4r; Veldener, *Fasciculus temporum*, fol. 283r.

355 See above, Chapter 1, pp. 35-37; 47.

356 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 20r, from Beke, *Croniken*, p. 8 (cap. 5), with variants which are not found in Veldener, *Fasciculus temporum*, fol. 283r. Appendix 1, title 6: ‘[..]tholomeus de proprietatibus rerum’.

357 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 20v, from ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sigs a2v-a3r, with additional detail from Veldener, *Fasciculus temporum*, fol. 219r.
island of Albion by Brutus and his men, who renamed the island Britain, and the giants’ settlement in the south of Holland. But the giants’ settlement, which in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ was dated to the twelfth century BC, in Jan’s account is placed in the first century BC, at the time of Julius Caesar. He clearly felt free to adjust his sources according to his own sense of history. His rearrangement of the chronology can be seen, on the one hand, as an attempt to bring the history back into line with the more traditional medieval account, represented by Beke, who had dated the earliest settlements in the region to the Roman period; but, on the other hand, it implied a classicizing of Holland’s history under the influence of humanism, confirmed by Jan’s subsequent addition of a detailed account of Caesar’s military career, which he attributed to several classical sources. Only at the foundation of the county of Holland in the time of Charles the Bald does Jan move back to using the ‘Dutch Beke’, from which point onwards it forms the backbone of his chronicle.

The version of the ‘Dutch Beke’ consulted by Jan ended, except for an added series of very succinct annals, in 1425. After this, the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ provided further historical information until the middle of the fifteenth century; but this work was much more concise than the ‘Dutch Beke’ and, on its own, was not enough to bridge the gap between the end of the account of the ‘Dutch Beke’ and Jan’s own time. For the later part of his chronicle, he therefore needed a new chronological framework, which he found in a recently printed chronicle of one of the other Habsburg domains in the Dutch Low Countries.

358 ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. a3v; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 20v.
360 All cited second-hand; see also below, pp. 104, 106.
361 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 25v, from Beke, Croniken, p. 42 (cap. 28).
362 Initially regularly interrupted with information from the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ (e.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 27v-28r, from ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sigs c6r-c7r, inserted between Beke, Croniken, capp. 39 and 40); such interruptions become less frequent in the course of the chronicle, as Jan increasingly uses longer (more or less uninterrupted) passages from Beke, e.g. MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 37v-46r, from Beke, Croniken, pp. 88-111 (cap. 55–63).
363 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 256v; Beke, Croniken, p. 385 (§67). In later pages, some short annals are taken over by Jan from the continuation to 1478 which is found in Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 130 C 10, fols. 145r-153r; e.g., MS Vitellius F xv, fol. 282v, several short annalistic entries parallel to MS 130 C 10, fol. 153r. See also above, n. 325.
364 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 261r; ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. m7v.
The ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’

As the central source providing the structure for the remainder of his chronicle, Jan used Die alder excellenste cronyke van Brabant – ‘The ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’, an illustrated history of Brabant produced specifically for print: it was first published in Antwerp in 1497, then brought up to date and reprinted in 1512. A chronicle of Brabant was an appropriate source for the history of Holland since both principalities had formed part of the Burgundian domains since the 1430s, when Philip the Good of Burgundy had become duke of Brabant as well as count of Holland (together with the numerous other titles he held). The history of the dukes of Brabant was, therefore, also the history of the counts of Holland; and the 1512 edition of the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’ contained sufficient information about the latter to supply the chronological framework for the final quires of Jan’s chronicle. Coincidentally, his version of the ‘Dutch Beke’ gave out just before the succession of Philip the Good to the county of Holland. From this point onwards, Jan made the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’, which he had not previously used as a source for his chronicle, his first port of call. At the same time, Jan Veldener’s Fasciculus temporum and its appended regional chronicles, together with the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, took on more significant roles than before. Jan continued to add material from various sources and, apparently, also from personal experience and from hearsay. His detailed knowledge of the events of the siege of Montfoort in 1489, which he recounts with a bias in support of one of the warring parties,
suggests that he may have been present; in any case, he had undoubtedly been in contact with several of the people involved. In such episodes, Jan enhanced the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’ with significant additions, as well as adjusting its political bias. We shall have a closer look at Jan’s treatment of the partisan wars of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries later in this chapter.

The ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’ did not attain the same status as the ‘Dutch Beke’ within Jan’s chronicle – apart from a reference in his list of sources, he never mentions it by title. Still, his reliance on a chronicle of Brabant is an indication of the extent to which he recognized that the different principalities of the region had become a more unified political entity. This development, which had found its initial expression in the work of Johannes a Leydis, had been confirmed in the regional chronicles in Veldener’s Dutch Fasciculus temporum: its chronicle of Holland finished with the succession of Philip the Good to the county, followed by a statement that the remainder could be read in the chronicle of Brabant.

So far, we have encountered two principal approaches adopted by Jan to his sources. Firstly, the ‘Dutch Beke’ (apart from the material strictly concerning Utrecht) and the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’ were taken up almost in their entirety and provided him with a chronological framework. Secondly, the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ and the regional chronicles in Veldener’s Dutch Fasciculus temporum were used for occasional short additions, as well as changes of phrase and of emphasis. Other sources were employed in the same way, but also for more substantial borrowings. While Jan generally limited his use of the ‘Dutch Beke’ to material concerning Holland, while at the

371 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 328v-329v; cf. M. P. van der Linden, De burggraven van Montfoort in de geschiedenis van het Sticht Utrecht en het graafschap Holland (1260-1490) (Assen, 1957), p. 173: in the absence of her husband, Jan III of Montfoort, Jan’s cousin Willem (Fig. 17) led the defence of Montfoort, though Jan does not mention this. Also relevant are the passages concerning his eponymous second cousin; cf. MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 326r-327v; Linden, Burggraven, p. 174.

372 In several places Jan has more extensive accounts of events in Holland, which are also more favourable to the party of the Hoeken; e.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 298v-299v, replacing Alder excellenste cronyke van Brabant, sig. dd4v, omits any praise for Egmond’s secret invasion of Dordrecht and does not present the events as the end of the Hoeken, as does the Brabant chronicle; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 313r-v, replacing Alder excellenste cronyke van Brabant, sig. ee3r; fol. 316r-318r, adding to sig. ee5r; fols 323r-327v, added between sigs ff1v and ff2r. Jan also accuses the Kabeljauwen of buying their influence at court: fol. 298v, ‘die cabbeliaus ... hadden oeck veel vrunden int hoff ende bij den princhs voerscreuen doer hoer scencken ende anders’. Finally, on fol. 313r-v, material from sig. ee3r is replaced by a passage in which the Kabeljauwen, who are referred to as ‘wrede honden ende scumers’, are accused of infanticide.

373 See below, pp. 135-137, 151, and Chapter 3, 210-214.

374 See above, Chapter 1, pp. 64-65; 71-73.
same time following its organization as an account of the succession of counts, he nevertheless expanded the scope of his chronicle by including information about regions far away from Holland and about subjects other than history per se.

**Geo-Political Expansion: Chronicles of France**

From its inception as a fiefdom of the Carolingian kings, Holland had been a principality within the Holy Roman Empire. Its political ties to the German territories to the east received historical emphasis in the episode of Count Willem II’s elevation to emperor-elect, which formed the centre of Beke’s chronicle. In the fifteenth century, as Holland became part of the Burgundian domains, its counts – the Dukes of Burgundy – were often more concerned to define themselves politically through their opposition to France. With the transfer of the Burgundian lands in the Low Countries to the Habsburgs, this hostile relationship to France was recombined with a positive link to the German parts of the Holy Roman Empire. From Jan’s perspective, this ambivalence between, on the one hand, the Burgundian heritage with its ties to France (even if negative), and, on the other, the Habsburg’s imperial aspirations, expressed itself in two main ways.

In the first place, it suggested that a clarification was needed concerning the early history of the county. Jan stressed the distinction between the Franks and the French, further strengthening the tendency already observed in the chronicle of the anonymous clerk a century earlier, and providing a cultural as well as a political justification for Holland’s inclination towards its eastern rather than its southern neighbours: ‘some people who do not understand the distinctions between things think that the kings of France separated this country into two parts; that is not so. For Holland was never French speaking, nor subject to the French.’ He then went on to point out that the Frankish kings had a long history before they ever conquered what is now France, and that after the Franks had adopted the French language, in recognition of the German origins of the Frankish emperors, the pope had decreed that only German speakers could ever hold the

375 See above, Chapter 1, p. 39.
377 See above, Chapter 1, pp. 52-53.
378 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 23r: ‘enighe luiden die der dinghen onderscheijt en verstaen die meijnnen dat dit cominghen van vrancrij sijn gheweest die dit lant aldus in twee hebben gheedeijt dat alsoe nijet en is Want hollant nije walsche tonghe en was noch onder der walen onderdanicheijt’.
The emphasis which he placed on this matter is apparent in a small, but telling, alteration which he made to his source. In describing the creation of Holland and Utrecht, Jan wrote that: ‘The princes of the Franks, who are called Carolingians, for a long period ruled the Roman Empire and also France. They separated Holland into two principalities.’ The ‘Dutch Beke’ had referred to the ‘princes of France’, not ‘of the Franks’.

Secondly, the distinction between the (German) Franks and the French was especially significant because, as Jan saw it, after almost a century of Burgundian counts, the county of Holland was firmly within the French sphere of influence. At least for the period from the late fourteenth century onwards, it was logical for him to look towards France for additional sources of historical information about the counts of Holland, whose political history, as the dukes of Burgundy, had been determined by their relations with the French crown.

Jean Froissart, Chroniques

Principal among these French sources was Froissart’s Chroniques, which had been available in print since the final years of the fifteenth century. Jean Froissart was born, probably in 1337, in the County of Hainault. He served his early career as a clerk of Philippa of Hainault, Queen of England and daughter of Willem, Count of Hainault as well as of Holland. After the death of his first patron, he spent the remainder of his life in the southern Low Countries, where he wrote his chronicles, while supported by a succession of patrons. His Chroniques, which covered the history of Western Europe in the period from the second quarter of the fourteenth century to the turn of the fifteenth, written in French, had a lasting impact throughout Europe.

Froissart’s chronicle exists in several, sometimes substantially different, at least partly authorial versions, and it is not entirely clear which version Jan consulted. Overall, his

---

379 Ibid., fols 23v-24r.
380 Ibid., fol. 24r: ‘Die princhen van vrancken die karolingi sijn gheheten die berechten langhe tijt dat roemsche rije ende mede vrancrijck Dese deelden hollant in tween heerscappien’, from Beke, Croniken, p. 9 (cap. 6): ‘Die princen van Vrancrijk die Karolingi ghenoemt sijn’ (my emphasis).
381 Documentary Appendix 1, title 26: ‘Heer jan froessaert in sijn cronijck’.
text agrees closely to the printed editions; and his use of a printed exemplar is further indicated by the fact that he had access to all four books of the work – the complete set was rare in manuscript. Although the early printed editions are nearly identical, Jan’s text seems most closely related to the one recently published in 1513 – perhaps indicating the speed with which he composed his chronicle. His text, however, includes a number of variants found only in manuscript. There appear to be two possibilities, neither of which can be confirmed with certainty: either Jan read the work in a manuscript version which is closer to the printed edition than any currently known one; or – as seems more


384 The manuscript most closely approximating Jan’s version is Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, mss fr. 2675-6 (c. 1430-40, but with the final part of book 3 c. 1500, possibly from a print edition). There is no indication that Jan had access to this particular manuscript; moreover, it is not known whether it ever included book 4. Further thanks to Godfried Croenen for information about the manuscript tradition of Froissart’s Chroniques, and for allowing me to consult the microfilm of this manuscript.

385 This is suggested by collation of a passage selected at random: MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 141r, ‘C ende xx’, ed. fol. 43r, 1498: ‘xxvi’, others: ‘vi.xx’/‘six vingtz’; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 145v: ‘robbert van baelioel’, ed. fol. 45r, 1498/1505: ‘loys de bailleul’, 1513/1518: ‘robert de bailleul’; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 146r: ‘robbert van glennes’, ed. fol. 45r: 1498/1505: ‘loys de bailleul’, 1513/1518: ‘robert de gleuues’. MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 113v, also shares variants with the 1513 edition, fol. 82v (e.g., ‘hastidonne’; the order of the references to ‘die heer van braston, die heer van labij’). For this note and the following one, I consulted four copies held in the British Library: shelfmarks ib41229 (1498), 1309k-11 (1505), 596b24 (1513), c77d15 (1518). References afterwards are to the 1513 edition, unless otherwise indicated.

386 E.g., at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 116v, Jan mentions the rumour that it was due to Hugh Dispenser ‘dat die scotten weder al hoer lant ende daer toe die goede stat van veerwijc ghewonnen hadden’; the reference to Berwich is not in the early editions, I, fol. 2v, but it is found in manuscripts (cf. J. Froissart, Chroniques, ed. Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove, 26 vols [Brussels, 1867-77], II, p. 22). MS Cotton Vitellius, fol. 128r, ‘Ende waren binnen dien zomere binnen der stede van condeijt in tueen tornocij na dat si ouer ghecomen waren Soude je v vertellen hoe vruchtlicken heer jan van den graue van hollant sijn broeder ontlanghen wart ic soude te voel te doen hebben ende zeer waren si beseaent die hem dese hoghe reijse ontraden hadden dat hij also grote ere in hadt behaelt also dat hij waerdich was alre eren’, incorporates elements found only in manuscript: Froissart, Chroniques, ed. Lettenhove, II, p. 102: ‘si leur fist li gentils sires de Biaumont toute honneur et le compagnie quil pot, et tournoierent II fois celle saison à Condet puis qu’il furent venut. Or me voel taire de ce gentil chevalier jusques à tant que point en sera, et revenray au jone roy Édouart d’Engleterre.’ The early editions have, I, fol. 7v: ‘Si leur fist tout lhomme et la compagnie quil peut et tournoyerent en celle saison a conde.’ MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 136r, has ‘m ce xlv’ for Edward III’s arrival at Sluis, agreeing with manuscripts (Froissart, Chroniques, ed. Lettenhove, IV, p. 313); the early editions, I, fol. 77r, have ‘mecxlvii’.
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likely – he himself (or a previous owner) added a number of details from a manuscript to a printed edition.\textsuperscript{387} We shall see below that Jan made frequent recourse to Froissart’s work.\textsuperscript{388}

Perhaps inspired by the realization that the history of the dukes of Burgundy had become part of the history of the county of Holland, Gerrit Potter van der Loo translated Froissart’s chronicle into Dutch in the first half of the fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{389} This translation remained unpublished and appears to have had very little impact. Today it is only known from two manuscript witnesses. Stylistic differences, however, rule out the possibility that Jan used Potter’s translation;\textsuperscript{390} and variants also make clear that he did not consult the French manuscript exemplar on which it was based.\textsuperscript{391}

In the light of Froissart’s connection to the court of the counts of Holland, and the involvement of these counts and their successors, the Dukes of Burgundy, in the events he describes, it is surprising how little influence his chronicles exerted on late medieval Dutch historians and on the broader readership for historical texts in the northern Low Countries.\textsuperscript{392} Jan was the only historian of Holland to make extensive use of the

\textsuperscript{387} Because of the uncertainty about the version Jan used as his exemplar, detailed analysis of his use of Froissart is unfeasible.

\textsuperscript{388} See below, p. 153; Chapter 3, pp. 205-207.


\textsuperscript{390} While Jan’s translations are to the point, Potter’s tend towards verbosity. See, e.g., Froissart, Chroniques, ed. Lettenhove, IX, pp. 388-9: ‘Alons au roy; il est jovènes, et li remonstrons nostre servitude et li dissons que nous vollons qu’il soit autrement, ou nous y pourverons de remède.’ Potter translates, in Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS BPL 3 I, fol. 71r: ‘Aldus dan laet ons een hert ende moet grijpen ende trekken tot onsen oncie die noch jonck is ende laet hem onse laste ende eygenscap dairmen ons tegens reden inne houdt te kennen geuen hem seggen dat wijt anders verandert willen hebben of wij willen dair selue in voirsien tot onsen profijt’; which Jan renders, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 161r: ‘Laet ons gaen totten coninck hij is jonck ende tonen hem onse verworpenheijt ende segghen hem dat wij willen dattet anders sjij off wij sullen daer teghens remedi vinden’. I am grateful to Dirk Schoenaers for providing me with images from the Leiden manuscript.

\textsuperscript{391} The research of Dirk Schoenaers, who identified the manuscript which Potter probably used, confirms that it did not contain the same version as Jan’s source, even though he must have been in contact with descendants of the Potter van der Loo family; a later Gerrit Potter van der Loo was bailiff of Naaldwijk in the second quarter of the sixteenth century: G. L. Meesters, ‘Waarom de één in Brussel wel Potter van der Loo genoemd wilde worden en de ander in Dordrecht niet’, in A. Snethlage et al. (eds), Liber amicorum Jhr. Mr. C. C. van Valkenburg (The Hague, 1985), p. 207-18; A. Janse, Ridderschap in Holland: portret van een adellijke elite in de late middeleeuwen (Hilversum, 2001), p. 300; C. Hoek, ‘Repertorium op de lenen van de Hofstad te Hontshol, 1253-1770’, Ons Voorgeslacht 27 (1972), pp. 149-304, nr 9.

\textsuperscript{392} The historical tradition of Guelders is an exception (see J. Baerten, ‘De invloed van Froissart op de Gelderse geschiedschrijving in verband met het huwelijkscontract tussen Reinald II en Sofia Berthout’, Bijdragen en Mededelingen der Vereniging ‘Gelre’ 68 [1974-5], pp. 51-6), together with a small number of passages in the continuation of the ‘Dutch Beke’ (Beke, Croniken, pp. 58 [n. 76], 246).
Chroniques, which, after the ‘Dutch Beke’, was the source which provided him with the most information for his chronicle: divided over several long passages, the material from Froissart totals over a hundred pages.\(^{393}\) This quantity is partly due to Froissart’s expansive narrative style, which Jan made little effort to curtail, translating long passages almost word for word.\(^{394}\)

He drew on Froissart for various episodes from the fourteenth century in which the family of the counts of Hainault, who were also the counts of Holland, had played a part, regularly adding the latter title when Froissart mentioned only Hainault,\(^{395}\) or simply substituting Holland for Hainault.\(^{396}\) So, for example, Jan appears to have included an extensive account of the siege of Calais because of the role played by Philippa of Hainault: following the surrender of the town, her husband, King Edward III of England, was planning to decapitate six burghers, but she persuaded him to spare their lives.\(^{397}\) Philippa, Jan proudly adds, ‘was a daughter of count Willem of Holland and Zealand and also of Hainault’.\(^{398}\) She formed a link between the ruling houses of Holland and England; through her, the counts of Holland became part of the English royal dynasty: ‘This queen of England, daughter of Holland’, Jan comments elsewhere, ‘had many sons with the king her husband, most prominently her eldest son, who was called Edward, Prince of Wales, and who was a devout lord’. He continues with a brief survey of Edward’s distinguished career, concluding: ‘This Prince was an honour to England, for which reason the king his father – although he died before him – promised him that his son would be king after him, and his brothers also committed themselves to this.’\(^{399}\) No

\(^{393}\) E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 116r-133v, 135v-148r, 150v-165r, 173r-175r, 93v-98v. References to Froissart are found at fols 122r, 138r, 150r, 152r, 168v, 173r, 92v, 93v.

\(^{394}\) The sometimes rather clumsy language of these passages seems to be the result of Jan’s almost verbatim translation from the French; cf., e.g., MS Vitellius F xv, fol. 125r: ‘Na dat dese justici ghedaen was die coninc ende die jonghe dispensier die hem seluen vonden in sulcker banghichede beleghe ende en saghien noch en wisten ghenen troest die hem te troeste off te baten comen mochte van gheenre zijden waeren seer besorcht’, with Froissart, Chroniques, I, fol. 6r: ‘Apres ce que ceste iustice fut faicte comme vous auez ouy le roy et messire hue le despensier qui se veoient assiegez a tel mescie f et ne scauoien nul comfort qui leur peust la endroit venir’ (ed. Lettenhove, II, p. 81 adds: ‘de nulle part’). Jan is probably also responsible for the occasional silly mistake, e.g., Froissart, Chroniques, I, fol. 45v, ‘vng cheualier mercenaire’; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 146r, ‘wt mijsen’.

\(^{395}\) E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 116v-133v, from Froissart, Chroniques, I, fols 2r-16v; there, fol. 120v, ‘willem van hollant ende henegouwen’, from fol. 4r, ‘Guillaume de Haynault’.

\(^{396}\) E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 145r, from Froissart, Chroniques, I, fol. 44r.

\(^{397}\) MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 151r-165r, from Froissart, Chroniques, I, fols 84r-100r.

\(^{398}\) MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 160r: ‘het dwelc een dochter was [van] graeff willem van hollant ende zeelant ende mede henegouwen’, addition to Froissart, Chroniques, I, fol. 99v, ‘la roynie dangleterre’.

\(^{399}\) MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 132v: ‘Dese cof[...] van enghelant een dochter van hollant creech veel zonen bij den coninck horen heer bijsonder hoer outste zoen dewele eduwaert was ghenoem[...] ende was prinche van waels het dwelc alten vromen heer was ... Dese princhs was een eer van enghelant waerom hem
doubt Froissart’s proximity to Philippa was one reason for Jan’s interest in his work, as is shown by the way he copies Froissart’s occasional first person narratives: ‘I have heard her say myself (says Froissart), when she was queen of England and I waited on her and served her...’ Jan’s inclusion of these long passages was based on dynastic, not geographical connections; his view of Holland and its history was deeply entangled with the house of its counts.

Yet he also took a few passages from Froissart describing episodes which did not feature the counts of Holland. Two of these concern rebellions: the first is an account of the uprising of Jacob Artevelde in Flanders, which may have had some connection in his mind to Holland, since he translates Froissart’s comment that Artevelde had promised King Edward III of England to install his son Edward as duke of a new Duchy of Flanders; the second is the Jacquerie in France. He includes, as well, a passage from Froissart about the ‘Crusade of Nicopolis’ of 1395. As will become clear below, this pattern is repeated with Jan’s other sources: while initially attracted to a text because of its usefulness as an historical source for the county of Holland, his interest quickly extended to other subjects which caught his eye, and prominent among these were rebellions and crusades.

Robert Gaguin, *Compendium de origine et gestis Francorum*

Unlike Froissart’s *Chroniques*, which had a barely discernible impact on historians in Holland, apart from Jan, the more recent work of Robert Gaguin exerted a powerful influence on Dutch historical writing. He was a central figure in humanist circles in Paris and was in contact with several scholarly visitors from Holland. His *Compendium de
origine et gestis Francorum was the platform from which Erasmus was first launched onto the international stage, when he wrote a letter to fill up the last few empty pages of the 1495 first edition. For a later edition, the same privilege was offered to Cornelius Aurelius, the Dutch humanist who later became famous for his treatises on the Batavian origin of the Hollanders and whom Jan van Naaldwijk believed to be the author of the Divisiekroniek.

Gaguin’s chronicle presents an account of French history from the creation of the world to the author’s own time, cast in humanist Latin. Like Jan – who may have been inspired by his example – Gaguin built his chronicle around the framework provided by the most important medieval chronicle in his chosen territory, the Grandes chroniques de France, with the addition of information from an impressive array of authorities, both in manuscript and in print, some of which were also used by Jan, such as Jean Froissart and St Antoninus of Florence. He also inserted material based on his own personal observations, for example of diplomatic missions he had himself carried out, including a muddled account of a failed embassy to Henry VII of England in 1489-90. He revised and expanded his history in two consecutive editions (1497, reissued in 1498; and 1500), adding information from further sources by authors such as Giovanni Simonetta and Flavio Biondo. Johan Huizinga wrote of Gaguin: ‘That his history would remain known chiefly because it had been a stepping stone to Erasmus, Gaguin could hardly have anticipated.’ This reversal of fortunes happened quickly, at least outside France. Jan’s first reference to Gaguin’s work in his chronicle includes a comment about the letter of Erasmus, showing that, for him, the humanist who recommended it mattered more than

408 Robert Gaguin, De origine et gestis Francorum perguanutile compendium, 3rd edition (Paris, 1497), sig. r5r-v. See below, Chapter 3, n. 784.
409 See below, Chapter 4, pp. 246-251.
411 Collard, Un historien, pp. 113-68, 331-51.
413 Collard, Un historien, pp. 279-321, 331-51.
414 Huizinga, Erasmus, p. 31.
the one who wrote it.\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 66r: ‘die gheleerde Gaguinus dewelc die kronijck van vrancrijc zeer oratoerlic bescreuen heeft (daer herasmus int proloech ghenoemt een heerlicke epistel in bescreuen heeft int laetste daer hij dese gaguinum zeer in prijst van sijnen arbeijt ende noemt hem een eer der fransoijsen)’. The description derives partly from the first sentence of the letter, in Robert Gaguin, \textit{Compendium super Francorum gestis} (Paris, 1511), fol. 307r: ‘Roberte Gagui ne precipuum gallice academie decus non possum equidem istum tuum laborem non magnopere probare.’ But see also below, Chapter 3, n. 784. I cite Gaguin from this edition unless otherwise noted.

\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 100r-v, from Gaguin, \textit{Compendium}, fols 126v-127r.}
\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 258v, from Gaguin, \textit{Compendium}, fols 211v-214r. See also below, pp. 131-131.}
\footnote{\textit{Alder excellenste croynke van Brabant}, sig. dd2r; found in MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, spread out over fols 293r and 295r.}
\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 293r-294r. See Curin, ‘Persusions’.
\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 66r, 148v, 185v, 98v, 213v, 263v, 265r, 267v, 268r, 277v, 290r, 318r.
\footnote{Ibid., fol. 175r (Jacquerie), from Gaguin, \textit{Compendium}, fol. 154r-v; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 108v-109r (Templars), reference to Gaguin at 108v.}

Afterwards Jan took over several short passages from the work, mostly in the part of his chronicle which was not dependent on the ‘Dutch Beke’.

Among the material he borrowed from Gaguin was a page-long anecdote about a lay brother who met the devil.\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 100r-v, from Gaguin, \textit{Compendium}, fols 126v-127r.} Another is the first part of a short account of the martyrdom of Joan of Arc for which Jan consulted several different sources.\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 258v, from Gaguin, \textit{Compendium}, fols 211v-214r. See also below, pp. 131-131.} One passage from Gaguin was particularly pertinent to relations between the Holy Roman Empire, France and Burgundy: it concerned the run-up to the marriage of Mary of Burgundy to Maximilian I of Habsburg. The ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’, which was Jan’s principal source in this part of the chronicle, did not report the fact that King Louis XI of France had attempted to unite the Burgundian lands with France by means of a marriage between Mary of Burgundy and his son Charles, the Dauphin.\footnote{Alder excellenste cryonyke van Brabant, sig. dd2r; found in MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, spread out over fols 293r and 295r.} Mary rejected the marriage, however, and was betrothed to Maximilian. Gaguin had acted as a messenger in the affair, dispatched in a last-ditch effort to garner support for the French king from the German princes. Jan took over Gaguin’s first-hand account of how the king of France had been cold-shouldered by the duchess of Burgundy and countess of Holland, when she preferred the German emperor to him, and how Mary’s choice of Maximilian had strengthened the latter’s support among the German princes.\footnote{Alder excellenste cryonyke van Brabant, sig. dd2r; found in MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, spread out over fols 293r and 295r.}

For the most part, however, what Jan borrowed from Gaguin were small pieces of information concerning the kings of France, which helped him to expand the accounts offered by his other sources.\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 66r, 148v, 185v, 98v, 213v, 263v, 265r, 267v, 268r, 277v, 290r, 318r.} Two further notes concerned the Jacquerie and idol worship by the Knights Templars.\footnote{Ibid., fol. 175r (Jacquerie), from Gaguin, \textit{Compendium}, fol. 154r-v; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 108v-109r (Templars), reference to Gaguin at 108v.} The inclusion of such material shows that Jan had a real concern for historical nuance that would enable him to embellish an already coherent version of events.
Figures 12a and 12b: Hartmann Schedel, *Liber cronicarum* (Nuremberg 1493), fols 63r, 79v

Images from Morse Library, Beloit College (www.beloit.edu/nuremberg/).
EXPANDING BEYOND THE REGION: THE NEW UNIVERSAL CHRONICLES

One of the most important historical genres in the late Middle Ages was the universal chronicle. Partly on its own merits and partly because it had been translated in the 1280s by Jacob van Maerlant, who soon came to be known as ‘the father of all Dutch authors’, the Speculum historiale of Vincent of Beauvais achieved enormous influence in the Dutch Low Countries, as the most authoritative of medieval historical sources. References to Vincent’s work were almost obligatory, even when authors had not actually consulted it.

In spite of its undoubted prestige, the Speculum historiale does not seem to have been the most widely consulted universal chronicle of the late Middle Ages in the Dutch Low Countries – there are several other contenders. Moreover, with the advent of printing, the genre received a new impulse. One incarnation, in particular, now became available to a wider audience: the illustrated universal chronicle. The Fasciculus temporum is an influential example, although its distinctive design was not adopted in other works. More common was a layout with images – cityscapes, battle scenes and human figures and occasionally depictions of specific historical events – inserted into the text to illustrate particular episodes.

Jan, however, did not introduce such an elaborate programme of illustrations into his chronicle: he included only five images, and no cityscapes or small portraits. Nor did he wrap his text around the images, as was customary in printed illustrated chronicles (Fig. 12a); instead, each of his illustrations spans the width of the written column (as in Fig. 12b; cf. Fig. 15). No model for Jan’s pictures can be found in any of his identified sources; he was more interested in these works for their textual content than for their visual imagery.

---

422 Jan van Boendale, Der leken spieghel, ed. J. J. Mak and H. A. C. Lambermont, on the CD-Rom Middelnederlands (The Hague and Antwerp 1998), III.126, ll. 119-20: ‘Jacob van merland oec, die vader / Der dietscher dichtren es algader’.


424 E.g., the chronicle of Martinus Oppaviensis, which deserves further study, and the Chronicon of St Antoninus of Florence, which had a powerful impact on Dutch historians in the later fifteenth century; see below, pp. 104-106.

425 See above, Chapter 1, pp. 70-71 and Fig. 8.

426 It seems likely that he combined elements from various sources to compose his illustrations; cf., e.g., the horse on the right-hand side of the illustration in Fig. 12a with Jan’s picture of a horse in Fig. 16.
Antoninus Florentinus, *Chronicon*

The Dominican saint, Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, wrote his large Latin chronicle in the 1450s; it achieved popularity in print. Its impact was strongest in Northern Europe; and in the Dutch Low Countries it received special attention from Johannes a Leydis, who wrote a short tract refuting some of Antoninus’s opinions about the Carmelite Order. The *Chronicon* was also recognized as an important historical source, drawn on not only by Johannes a Leydis and Jan van Naaldwijk, but also by the author of the *Divisiekroniek*. It was one of the least recognized, but most influential, ‘foreign’ sources for the historiography of Holland in this period.

Jan used the chronicle on several occasions throughout his chronicle, sometimes for small bits of information, sometimes for self-contained narratives, with only tenuous links (if any) to other historical events or personalities in his chronicle: for instance, the popular story of a young man who accidentally married a statue of Venus. Mostly, however, he took large-scale historical information from it, ranging from a few pages about the career of Julius Caesar, or the persecution of the Templars, to a substantial passage about the ascent of Francesco Sforza to the dukedom of Milan. Jan also

---

427 Documentary Appendix 1, title 10: ‘Anthoninus in sijn cronijcken’.


429 Ibid., pp. 150-2.

430 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Selden Supra 41, fols 338r-341r. Copy by John Bale, c. 1540. Leydis’s reaction calls into question the more positive evaluation of Antoninus’s treatment of the Carmelites in Walker, *The ‘Chronicles’*, pp. 143-5.


432 References at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 28v, 37r, 37v, 62v, 64v, 67v, 77r, 78r, 78v, 79v, 103r, 108r, 109r, 114v, 200r, 214r, 223r, 243r, 261v and 269r.


434 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 269r-271v. For the reason why Jan included this passage in his chronicle, see below, pp. 109, 129-130.
included a lengthy passage about the Tartars, inspired, no doubt, by his hope, which he shared with many of his contemporaries, that the Tartars would turn out to be valuable allies in the wars against the Muslims. This Cassianus Khan was of short stature, but great generosity; an ugly countenance, but he was very wise, intelligent and clever, and he had all kinds of virtues, a friend of the Christians. He eventually became a Christian and received baptism, and he convinced many of his people to do the same. For the consolation of the Christians, I shall describe how he was converted.

The story of Cassianus’s conversion is followed by a long ethnographic account of the Tartars (touching on a range of issues, from their appearance – ‘their eyebrows hang over their eyes, because these are so small and sunken’ – to their customs – ‘their eating habits are revolting: they lick their greasy and smirched fingers and use their boots for drying them’), and a geography of their country of origin and conquests.

Most of this borrowed material appeared in the chronicle in its proper chronological place, except for an earlier digression about the Tartars, which is inserted in a passage derived from the ‘Dutch Beke’. Here it was described how a messenger, reporting that Utrecht was under siege by an army from a particular region in Holland, had claimed ‘that the Tartars had arrived’. Jan adds, between brackets:

They brought the message that the Tartars had arrived (this was a heathen people who had an emperor called the Great Khan, and in these times they had subjected many countries and empires to shameful oppression .... They have beastly customs and are very avaricious and always expect something from emissaries who have been sent to them and their leaders. Vincent of Beauvais and Antoninus write marvellously about

---

438 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 79v-85r, taken from Antoninus Florentinus, Opus, III, fol. 82v (xx.viii.viii-ix); III, fols 48v-53r (xix.viii.i, iii-iv, vii-x, xii-xv, xvii).
440 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 79v: ‘Dese cassianus kan was cleijn van statuer mer groet moedich lelic van aensicht mer zeer wijs subtijl ende cloec ende vol alre doechden een vrunt der kerstenen Hijer na is hij kersten ghewarden ende heeft het doopssell onfanghen daer hij oek menich van den zijnen toe heeft ghebracht Hoe dat hij bekeert wart dat sal je v bescriuen tot een troest der kerstenen’.
441 Ibid., fol. 80v: ‘hoer wijnbrouwen hanghen ouer hoer oghen also cleijn ende hol sijnse’.
442 Ibid., fol. 82r: ‘Het dwelc sij oek lelicken eten sij licken hoer vette ende besmoute vingheren ende droeghense an hoer laersen’.
443 Ibid., fol. 67v, from Beke, Croniken, p. 143 (cap. 70, l. 38): ‘dat die tartaren ghecomen waren’.
them in their books and chronicles) and had completely surrounded the city with countless soldiers.\textsuperscript{444}

The reference to the Tartars was intended metaphorically; nevertheless, it gave Jan the opportunity to display his ethnographic knowledge. He then continued the account of the siege of Utrecht, which he had left off in mid-sentence.

Conveniently, Antoninus often mentioned his sources for particular passages, which may have been the source of inspiration for Jan to do the same in his chronicle, and allowed him to enrich his own list of sources with titles he had not necessarily seen first-hand, including the reference above to Vincent of Beauvais.\textsuperscript{445} It is possible that one reason why Antoninus’s chronicle was particularly appealing to Jan, and to his contemporaries in the Dutch Low Countries, was precisely its frequent appeals to the authority of the \textit{Speculum historiale}.\textsuperscript{446} Even though Vincent’s chronicle had been available in printed editions since about 1473,\textsuperscript{447} Jan did not consult it directly, but instead took over references to it from Antoninus’s \textit{Chronicon}. Occasionally, these references did not actually occur in the passages of Antoninus’s chronicle used by Jan, but were taken from a previous or subsequent chapter.\textsuperscript{448} This shows that he was keen to include the \textit{Speculum historiale} among his sources, and it confirms the impression that, more than two centuries after Jacob van Maerlant’s translation, Vincent’s work still occupied a special status in the Dutch Low Countries.

The \textit{Chronicon} also provided Jan with other titles in his list of sources; authorities to whom he referred in his text as well, including classical authors concerning Julius Caesar: Orosius, Eutropius, Suetonius, Lucan and Augustine.\textsuperscript{449} Once again, this is a sign of Jan’s

\textsuperscript{444} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 67v: ‘boetscapten hem dat die tartaren ghecomen waren (dit was[…] onghelouich volc ende hadden een keijser die sij noemen d[…]ten kaen ende hadden in desen tiden voel landen ende rijcken t[…] hoer subiecci ghebracht ende zeer scandelicke onderdanicheit … Ende seluer ho[,]ten sij een beestelieke manier ende sijn zeer ghierich ende willen altijt wat hebben van die ambassiaten die tot hem luiden ende an hoer heren ghesonden warden Hijer bescrijft vincencius gallus ende anthoninus wonder in hoer boecken ende cronijcken) ende hadden dije stat al om beleghen met ontallicke wapentueres’.

\textsuperscript{445} It appears in his list of sources (Documentary Appendix 1), title 9: ‘Vincencius in sijn spieghel historiael’.

\textsuperscript{446} For the \textit{Speculum historiale} as one of Antoninus’s sources, see Walker, \textit{The ‘Chronicles’}, pp. 55-6.

\textsuperscript{447} Goff V282-3.

\textsuperscript{448} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 29r (from Antoninus Florentinus, \textit{Opus}, II, fol. 201r-v [xvi.vii.iii]), 62v (reference, lifted out of context, from III, fol. 54v [xix.xxii]), 67v (reference, again out of context, from III, fol. 51v [xix.xii]), 82v (from III, fol. 51r [xix.viii.x]), 85r (from III, fol. 54v [xix.xxii]).

\textsuperscript{449} Documentary Appendix 1, titles 1: ‘[…] uuen van julius cesar’ (probably Orosius); 2: ‘[…] int leuen van julius cesar’ (probably Eutropius); 3: ‘[…] int leuen van julius cesar’ (probably Lucan); 4: ‘[…]onius int boeck van den xij keijseren’; 5: ‘[…]justinus de ciuitate dei van julius cesar’; references in MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 20v (titles 1, 2), 21r (title 3), and 21v (titles 4, 5). References taken from Antoninus
eagerness to include such references in his work. As we have seen, he reorganized the chronology of the earliest history of the region, placing it in the classical era, rather than in a pre-classical mythical past, as the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ had done. From this perspective, we can perhaps see the legend of the Batavians, who were soon to become the classical forebears of the Hollanders, as developing out of the kind of experiments in history writing carried out not only by Beke and by the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, but also by this amateur historian, compiling his work at the very moment when, just beyond his intellectual reach, humanist scholars were starting to extract the Batavian myth from the writings of Tacitus.

**Jacobus Philippus Foresti Bergomensis, *Supplementum supplementi chronicarum***

The *Supplementum supplementi chronicarum* of Jacobus Philippus Foresti Bergomensis, initially published without images, was reissued as an illustrated chronicle in its third edition, published in 1486, which was decorated with cityscapes. In Italian and Spanish translations, the chronicle received wide popularity among a varied readership, and it was also printed six times in Latin before the end of the century. It became one of the main sources for the chronicle of the German humanist Hartmann Schedel. In successive editions, Foresti enlarged the work, not only bringing it up to date by adding more recent material at the end, but also expanding the contents throughout; and it was in such an edition that Jan consulted the work.

---

Florentinus, *Opus*, I, fol. 64r (iii.v.xxxi) (Lucan), ibid. (iii.v.xxxii) (Orosius and Eutroptius), ibid., fol. 64v (iii.v.xxxiii) (Suetonius and Augustine). A final classical reference, to Virgil’s *Aeneid* (Documentary Appendix 1, title 14: ‘Virgilius in sijn eneijdos’; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 336r), is erroneous: the quotation (‘Magna in exiquo regnabat corpore virtus’) is not from Virgil, but Statius (*Thebaid*, ed. D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Thebaid Books I-VII* [Cambridge, MA, 2003], p. 70 [lib. 1, l. 417]), and it is about Tydeus, not Octavian; the misattribution may well have been due to Jan’s misunderstanding of his intermediary source, which I have been unable to identify.

---

450 Documentary Appendix 1, title 13: ‘Bergomensis in sijn supplement ende cronijck’.


453 Zampieri, *Le prime vedute di Pisa*, pp. 36-38, gives a complete list of the Latin and Italian editions.


455 Ibid., pp. 78-89.

He used it on many occasions; and, as with other large chronicles, particularly in the second half of his work, he often took from it material concerning heresy (the ‘fraticelli de opinione’ and a flagellant), the East (the conquests of the Tartar King Tamerlane), the crusader orders, and the international affairs of the houses of Burgundy and Habsburg. He also retells the anti-Semitic blood libel story about Simon of Trent, as popular as it was gruesome. For his version, Jan combined the accounts of Foresti and Hartmann Schedel. This episode was typical of the exciting, even sensationalist, material which Jan borrowed from Foresti’s chronicle, such as the Pazzi Conspiracy, involving treacherous murder, ironic prophecy and retributory execution, served up with a special sauce of dialogue and hearsay evidence.

In most cases, there is not much of a link between the material Jan took over from the *Supplementum chronicarum* and his Dutch sources. Only once does a Dutch work provide him with the opportunity of including information from Foresti: when the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’ reported that ‘in this year [i.e., 1482] there was a great commotion and war in Rome and all over Italy’, Jan filled in the detail with the aid of a short account of the War of Ferrara from the *Supplementum chronicarum*. Other borrowed passages, usually much longer, were inspired by recent developments, which

---

457 See MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 77r, 88r, 99r, 108r, 110r, 172v, 199r, 219v, 242v, 273r, 290r, 309v, 311r, 311v, 331r, 333r, 335r, 337v, 343r, 345v.


459 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 199r-200r, from Foresti, *Supplementum*, fol. 359r.

460 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 108r, from Foresti, *Supplementum*, fol. 327v. Other sources mentioned there are Biondo, Schedel and Antoninus, who is used for the remainder of the account.


462 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 290r-v, from Foresti, *Supplementum*, fol. 413r; Schedel, *Liber chronicarum* (Nuremberg, 1493), fol. 254v.


464 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 311v-312r, from Foresti, *Supplementum*, fol. 422r-v, inspired by ‘in dit jaer was grote commocie ende oerloghe te rome ende in ijtalijen ouer al’, taken from *Alder excellente cronyke van Brabant*, sig. ee2v.
led Jan to reconsider the traditional subjects found in chronicles of Holland. The origin of Bohemia,\textsuperscript{465} for instance, would not normally be considered an appropriate topic to deal with in a history of Holland. Maximilian I of Habsburg, however, counted among his ancestors Rudolph I of Habsburg, King of Bohemia.\textsuperscript{466}

Another borrowing from Foresti explains why, earlier in the chronicle, Jan included an account about Francesco Sforza:\textsuperscript{467} Maximilian I, at the time of the death of his father, the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick III, married Bianca Maria, daughter of Francesco Sforza, Duke of Milan.\textsuperscript{468} The alliance not only extended Maximilian’s power over the duchy of Milan, but also justified Jan’s inclusion of the Milanese Sforza family in his history of Holland. By treating such material, he innovatively expanded that history into France, Italy and Bohemia. Yet it also shows just how rooted Jan was in the tradition of historical writing about Holland: since his chronicle was structured around the individuals who had held the title ‘count of Holland’, their other titles provided a guide to which material was suitable for inclusion.

**Hartmann Schedel, Liber cronicarum (‘The Nuremberg Chronicle’)\textsuperscript{469}**

Arguably the most influential of the new large printed chronicles in the Dutch Low Countries was the so-called ‘Nuremberg Chronicle’, anonymously published by Hartmann Schedel. It was available in both German and Latin; but Jan, who listed it among his Latin sources, used the latter edition.\textsuperscript{470} He refers to it as the ‘Large Chronicle with the Figures’, the title which appeared on the first page in the Latin edition: ‘Registrum huius operis libri chronicarum cum figuris et imaginibus ab initio mundi’. The work’s importance for Dutch historiography has largely been seen in terms of its use as a

\textsuperscript{465} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 77r-v, from Foresti, *Supplementum*, fol. 18v.


\textsuperscript{467} See above, p. 104.

\textsuperscript{468} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 333r, from Foresti, *Supplementum*, fol. 441r.

\textsuperscript{469} Documentary Appendix 1, title 17: ‘Die grote cronijck met die figuren’.

\textsuperscript{470} Cf., e.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 108r: ‘Coninc phillips dewelc bedroghen was van sijn officiers’, from Schedel, *Liber cronicarum*, fol. 222v, ‘rex francie seductus (vt fertur) ab officialibus suis’, not Schedel, *Das Buch der Croniken und Geschichten* (Nuremberg, 1493) fol. 222v, ‘do wardt der könig zu frankreich von seinen ambtlewten (als man sagt) also verlaytet’; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 108v, ‘Dewelc ghenoemt was jacob ende was van borgonghen gheboren van den heren van molaij’, from Schedel, *Liber cronicarum*, fol 222v, ‘iacobus burgundus origine et ex dominis molay genitus’, while Molay is not mentioned in Schedel, *Das Buch der Croniken*, fol. 222v: ‘Jacobus ein burgundier’.
visual and structural model for the *Divisiekroniek*; but Jan also drew on it, though less extensively than the author of the *Divisiekroniek*.

Jan turned to the ‘Nuremberg Chronicle’ mainly to add details to episodes for which he found more substantial information in his other sources: its account of the reign of Rudolph I serves as an introduction to Antoninus’s discussion of the origin of Bohemia; it provides an alternative explanation for the persecution of the Templars, as well as material on the transfer of their property to the Knights of St John; and it allows Jan to enrich an account of the flagellants of Italy with a short note about the burning of the movement’s founder as a heretic. We have seen above that Jan’s retelling of the blood libel of Simon of Trent was based not only on Foresti’s but also on Schedel’s chronicle; and he took from it small additional pieces of information about Tamerlane and the Council of Constance. Schedel’s *Liber cronicarum* was the most lavish and possibly the most expensive of Jan’s sources. The limited use he made of it suggests that he may not have owned a copy of the book and had only a brief opportunity to take notes to add to the subjects he had a particular interest in.

**Flavio Biondo, *Historiarum ab inclinatione Romanorum imperii decades***

The work which Jan refers to as Biondo’s ‘Decades and Chronicle’ was written in various stages from the mid-1430s to the early 1450s. It was regarded as a universal chronicle, although, in contrast to the works of Antoninus, Foresti and Schedel, it focuses mostly on Italy, particularly in the sections on Biondo’s own time. Biondo has been called ‘the

---

471 Tilmans, *Historiography*, pp. 100, 141-2; the author of the *Divisiekroniek* appears to have used the German edition of the chronicle: ibid., p. 164.

472 References at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 76v, 79r, 108r, 110r, 172v, 199r, 214v, 222r, 222v and 290r.

473 Ibid., fol. 76v; from Schedel, *Liber cronicarum*, fol. 216r.


475 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 110r; from Schedel, *Liber cronicarum*, fol. 223r.

476 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 172v; from Schedel, *Liber cronicarum*, fol. 235r.


479 Documentary Appendix 1, title 12: ‘Blondus in sijn decades ende cronijck’.


first medieval historian’, because he recognized a ‘medium aevum, even if not using the phrase’. In chronicles of Holland, as I have argued in the previous chapter, a concept of a middle age between two ideal(ized) eras was already present in Beke’s Chronographia. Biondo’s Decades could not only be used by historians of Holland as a source of historical information, but, because of its similarities to Beke’s vision, could also be easily adopted as a model for organizing an historical work.

The reference to Biondo by the humanist Petrus Montanus, in a 1504 letter to Gerard Geldenhouwer Noviomagus, has been considered ‘worthy of recording in the history of humanism’ in the Dutch Low Countries. Equally significant, surely, is the use of Biondo by a relative amateur like Jan only a decade later, though he consulted only an abbreviated version of the Decades produced by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Pope Pius II, who transformed the Latin into a more humanist style.

Jan mentions Biondo only twice, both times taking over small bits of information from the epitome. The first passage is about the evacuation of women, children, the elderly and the infirm at night during the siege of Acre in 1291; the other concerns the causes of the persecution and destruction of the Templars. Yet these references are not second-hand: they are correct and cannot be found in any of Jan’s other sources. As with the ‘Nuremberg Chronicle’, Jan’s limited reliance on this work suggests that he may have consulted it only fleetingly. If so, the passages he cites again confirm Jan’s interest in the crusades and in heresy, which was, at least in part, polemical, as he makes clear elsewhere: ‘I [hesitate] to describe the great abominations carried out then by [the Turks], but I will describe it so that it may some day be avenged on these dogs.’

---

482 Ibid., pp. 116-17.
483 See above, Chapter 1, pp. 34-34.
484 See Tilmans, Historiography, p. 50, for use of Biondo’s work as a source in the Divisiekeroniek, and p. 142, as an organizational model. However, she overestimates the importance of Biondo’s work as a model at the expense of the pre-existing tradition based on Beke’s chronicle, apparently regarding the three-tier structure of historiography as a Renaissance humanist innovation. See also below, Chapter 3, n. 720.
486 He had earlier maintained that this task was beyond his own capacities: Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Commentarii, ed. I. Bellus and I. Boronkai (Budapest, 1993), p. 556 (XI.23).
487 Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Abbreviatio supra Decades Blondi (Rome, 1481), in his Opera omnia (Basel, 1551), pp. 144-281. MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 78v (Piccolomini, Abbreviatio, dec. II.viii, fol. 253r); fol. 108r (Piccolomini, Abbreviatio, dec. II.ix, fol. 259r).
488 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 273r: ‘Ick […]n mij te scriuen die grote ondacht die sjij daer bedreuen […]ben mer op dattet noch op die honden ghewroken mach warden sal ict bescriuen’.
THE EXPANDING WORLD: ITINERARII

Jan’s interest in the crusades and, more generally, in the East, also finds expression through his inclusion of several travel narratives in his chronicle. Modern scholars are eager to distinguish between ‘fictional’ and ‘non-fictional’ travel accounts, yet they have few qualms about classifying itineraries as historiographical sources. Late medieval readers, however, may have had less concern about distinguishing between accounts of imaginary and actual journeys, but a stronger sense of the difference between historical works and itineraries. As we have seen, Jan was fascinated by ethnographic information, which helps to explain his reliance on itineraries in his chronicle. His interest in this kind of material provides an indication, long before Dutch involvement in the ‘Age of Discovery’, of a growing awareness that the expansion of the world had historical, as well as geographical and cultural, implications.

Marco Polo, De consuetudinibus et conditionibus orientalium regionum

Jan took over an account of the journeys of Christopher Columbus from Foresti’s chronicle. Appended to it, after a comment about the discovery of the Fortunate Isles

---


491 Exceptional is Bede’s inclusion of an abbreviated version of Adamnan’s De locis sanctis in his Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum, ed. B. Colgrave, R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969), pp. 508-12 (V.16-7). For an overview of the genre, see Richard, Les récits de voyages. The kinship between the itinerary and the saint’s life may be stronger than that between the itinerary and the chronicle; and there is little indication that medieval readers perceived intrinsic differences between Sir John Mandeville, St Brendan and Marco Polo.

492 See above, p. 105-106.

493 In addition to the works below, there are also references to John Mandeville and Odericus (MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 116r), but these were taken from Veldener, Fasciculus temporum, fol. 178v, and not included in the list of sources.


495 Documentary Appendix 1, title 32: ‘Wt die wanderinghe van heer marcus [ ]’.

496 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 337v-338v, from Foresti, Supplementum, fol. 440v-441r.
(the Canary Islands) during the reign of Ferdinand II of Aragon, is a description of other islands, in which Marco Polo is mentioned; his book is also listed among Jan’s Dutch sources, although there is no evidence that a Dutch translation existed. The description, at any rate, does not come from any standard text of Marco Polo’s work and refers to various fabulous islands, including the version of the tale of the island of Hippocrates’s Dragon Daughter found in Mandeville’s Travels. Jan’s treatment of Columbus and Marco Polo as authorities on the same subject, together with his (unattributed) use of anecdotal material from Mandeville’s Travels in the same context, is typical of late medieval and early modern notions of travel and discovery.

**Johannes de Hese, Itinerarius per diversas mundi partes**

Accounts of pilgrimages to the Holy Land were very popular in the Dutch Low Countries: more than thirty different titles were copied or printed in the fifteenth century alone, some of which had immense circulation. A cleric from the diocese of Utrecht, Johannes de Hese, presented his work as a true account of a journey to Jerusalem in 1389 and, then, from Egypt to the land of Prester John, ending in the exotic islands of the East. In fact, the work was compiled from information in earlier works, including accounts of the travels of Sir John Mandeville and St Brendan, and the *Letter of Prester John*. The

---

497 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 338v, from Foresti, *Supplementum*, fol. 438v. Jan interprets ‘additae sunt’ as discovery, which may not be how it was meant in his source.

498 Marco Polo, *Delle maravigliose cose del mondo*, c. 1298, 1st edition in German (*Buch des edlen Ritters und Landfahrers Marco Polo*), Nuremberg 1477 (Goff P901); a Latin edition (*De consuetudinibus et conditionibus orientalium regionum*) was printed by Gerard Leeu in Gouda in 1484 (Goff P902; see C. Sanz, *El Libro de Marco Polo: Notas historicas y bibliograficas* [Madrid, 1958], p. 20; K. Goudriaan et al. [eds.], *Een drukker zoekt publiek – Gheraert Leeu te Gouda 1477-1484* [Delft, 1993], pp. 238-9, no. 61). Although there is no known early Dutch translation, one may very well have existed, since Leeu regularly printed parallel editions in Latin and one or more vernacular languages (cf., e.g., Goudriaan, *Een drukker*, pp. 224-41, nos 24 and 29; 30, 34 and 35; 16 and 46). The earliest known Dutch edition of Marco Polo, however, is from 1664 (Sanz, *El Libro*, p. 21).

499 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 340v; Jan’s version is independent of the Dutch translation of Mandeville’s *Travels, Mandevile* (Antwerp, 1494), fols 11v-12v. It is possible that he was working from a Latin version such as that in British Library, shelfmark G.6728, which contains both Marco Polo and Mandeville.


501 Documentary Appendix 1, title 16: ‘Die wanderinghe van Johannes de hese priester’.


date of composition is uncertain, but the oldest extant manuscript is from the second quarter of the fifteenth century. First printed in 1490, it proved very popular: it was reprinted ten times by c. 1507. In some of these editions, the text was directly followed by a description of the ‘nations’ or peoples of the Christian world, the *Divisiones decem nationum totius Christianitatis*.

A Dutch version of Johannes de Hese’s *Itinerarius* existed, but not in print; Jan’s translation is, in any case, independent of it. He placed the text directly after a report of the death and burial of Duke Albert I of Bavaria, during whose reign the journey had reportedly taken place. He translated the entire text, followed by the complete *Divisiones decem nationum totius Christianitatis*. The latter text probably interested him as much as the travel account, since it concluded with an historical rationalization of heresy, explaining it as a result of the conditions of the early Church. This argument may have been part of a polemic for Conciliarism, which was also reflected in some of Jan’s other sources: ‘The reason for this great division among the Christians is that in past times the Christians were not allowed to hold common assemblies or councils. Because of this, there have been many heretics.’

**Bernhard von Breydenbach, *Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctam***

A final itinerarius used by Jan as a source is Bernhard von Breydenbach’s *Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctam*, an incunable containing a description of a pilgrimage which took

---

504 Ibid., p. 67.
505 Ibid., pp. 84-106.
506 Johannes de Hese, *Itinerarius per diversas mundi partes* (Deventer, 1499), sig. a7r; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 91r.
507 The oldest extant witness of the translation (which itself was probably made in the mid-fifteenth century) is from the late seventeenth century: Westrem, *Broader Horizons*, pp. 109-20; see pp. 185-201, for an edition of the Dutch text. Given Jan’s complete translation of the text, S. D. Westrem, ‘A Medieval Travel Book’s Editors and Translators: Managing Style and Accommodating Dialect in Johannes Witte de Hese’s Itinerarius’, *The Medieval Translator* 4 (1994), pp. 153-80, at 165, is incorrect to say that ‘only one Dutch translation was made’.
509 But see the comments below, p. 118.
510 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 92r-v: ‘Die saeck van de sen groten onderscheijt tusken die kerstenen is dat in tijden voerleden die kerstenen bedwonghen waren dat si gheen ghemeijnen raet ende consilia met een en mochten houwen Hijerom sijnder veel ketters opghestaen’.
511 Documentary Appendix 1, title 35: ‘Wt een boeck ghemaect van heren barnhart van bre[ ]’. 
place in 1483-4 from Oppenheim near Mainz to Jerusalem, then from there to St Catherine’s monastery at the foot of Mount Sinai, and back to Venice. The work is richly illustrated with realistic pictures, produced by one of the pilgrims, Erhard Reuwich of Utrecht, of many of the towns, cities, islands and regions along the route, including six panoramic folding plates, as well as images of various peoples encountered along the route, apparently depicted in local dress. It was printed, possibly by the illustrator, in successive editions in Latin, German and Dutch between 1486 and 1488. The illustrations, no doubt, contributed to its popularity; and it continued to be printed in the following decades. Jan used the Dutch edition, listing it among his Dutch sources.

He did not, however, draw on the *itinerarius*, which made up the bulk of the book, but instead used the work as an historical source, taking material from the section following Breydenbach’s description of the return journey, which consisted for the most part of a history of Ottoman sieges and conquests from the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 to the Christian reconquest of Otranto in 1480-81, cobbled together from various authors. Jan simplified Breydenbach’s account of the initial stages of the siege of Rhodes in 1480, but otherwise copied most of the text verbatim. His use of the *Peregrinatio* shows his particular interest in crusader stories – he may have been drawn to this one because it was a rare occasion after the First Crusade where such episodes had a happy ending for the Christians.

Breydenbach’s *Peregrinatio in Terram Sanctam* was only one of several texts which Jan treated in this way. These works have little in common apart from the fact that they provided him with information about particular historical episodes.

---


513 Davies, *Bernhard von Breydenbach*, p. xxxii.

514 Ibid., pp. x-xi.

515 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 304r-309v, from Bernhard von Breydenbach, *Die heylighe beuarden tot dat heylighe grafft in iherusalem* (Mainz, 1488), sigs z4v-76r.
MISCELLANEOUS HISTORICAL SOURCES

Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini (Pope Pius II), *Cosmographia* 516

As we have seen, 517 Jan gave a prominent place at the beginning of his chronicle to the description of the region. He also added to the standard geographical account of Holland, deriving ultimately from Bartholomeus Anglicus, a further clarification of the relationship between Utrecht, Holland and the Frisians. Drawing on the *Cosmographia* of Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, 518 he explained that although Utrecht was now a direct fiefdom from Rome, throughout history it had at different times been part of both Friesland and Holland.

By the early sixteenth century, Beke’s contention that Holland and Utrecht had originally been one entity and that this unity should be restored could receive new meaning in the dramatically changed political landscape. Holland was now part of the Burgundian Habsburg possessions. The diocese of Utrecht was politically allied to the Burgundian Netherlands, but its territories had not yet been incorporated into the larger unit. According to Piccolomini’s description of the relations between Friesland, Holland and Utrecht, the diocese was subordinate to the surrounding principalities. This view appears to play a polemical role in Jan’s work, instead outlining the desired power relations in the alliance between the diocese of Utrecht and the Burgundian lands of the Habsburg rulers. Although Piccolomini’s work had enormous influence on humanist historians in Germany, 519 Jan’s use of it was limited to this minor point and served merely to emphasize a partisan political view.

In addition to Piccolomini’s *Cosmographia* and his epitome of Biondo’s *Decades*, Jan also knew and admired his *De duobus amantibus Eurialo et Lucretia opusculum*, a story of two lovers which was one of the most successful products of the early printing press, both in the original Latin and in various vernacular translations. In the Low Countries alone, it was printed six times before the end of the 1480s. 520 Jan’s reference to it is interesting, since he specifically mentions the Dutch translation and says that the wide

516 Documentary Appendix 1, title 7: ‘[..]neas siluius in sijn cosmographia’.
517 See above, p. 90, n. 354.
519 P. Joachimsen, ‘Tacitus im deutschen Humanismus’, *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutschen Literatur* 17 (1911), pp. 697-717.
availability of this version means that he does not have to include it in his chronicle.\footnote{MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 223r: ‘Mer want dit gheprent is in duijtss en wil ick hijerom ghenen verloren arbeijt doen om dat ouer te setten wt den latijnen’.
Elsewhere, Jan uses High German as distinct from Dutch; e.g., fols 284r, 362v. Coincidentally, an early German translation appears together with a translation of Poggio’s letter about Jerome of Prague in Nicolaus von Wyle, Translationen etlicher Bücher (Esslingen, c. 1478); but Jan did not use this version, see below, n. 549.}
This statement not only provides additional evidence for the existence of a Dutch version, now lost,\footnote{Possibly, such a translation was printed by Jan van Doesborch of Antwerp, who may have printed the English version, and regularly produced parallel editions in English and Dutch; W. Nijhoff and M. E. Kronenberg, Nederlandsche bibliographie van 1500 tot 1540, 6 vols (The Hague, 1923-71), no. 2240; Debaene, Nederlandse volksboeken, p. 208, gives a summary of the evidence. The attribution is challenged, however, by P. J. A. Franssen, Tussen tekst en publiek: Jan van Doesborch, drukker-uitgever en literateur te Antwerpen en Utrecht in de eerste helft van de zestiende eeuw (Amsterdam, 1990), pp. 18, 20.} but also indicates that, in contrast to contemporary Northern humanists, for whom the vernacular was of no interest,\footnote{P. A. Becker, Jean Lemaire: Der erste humanistische dichter Frankreichs (Strasbourg, 1893); P. Jodogne, Jean Lemaire de Belges: écrivain franco-bourguignon (Brussels, 1971); K. M. Munn, A Contribution to the Study of Jean Lemaire de Belges: A Critical Study of Bio-Bibliographical Data, Including a Transcript of Various Unpublished Works (New York, 1936).} translation was central to Jan’s aim of expanding the historical tradition of Holland. Jan’s goal was not to contribute to recent learning, but his chronicle was a project of \emph{translatio} at least as much as one of \emph{compilatio}.

\textbf{Jean Lemaire de Belges, \emph{La légende des Vénitiens} and \emph{l’Histoire du prince Sophy}}\footnote{J. Kem, Jean Lemaire de Belges’s Les Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye. The Trojan Legend in the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance (New York etc., 1994).}

Jean Lemaire de Belges had a distinguished career as a diplomat and a writer – historian, propagandist, polemist, moralist, satirist, poet and entertainer of women – in the court, first, of Margaret of Austria (daughter of Maximilian I and from 1507 governor of the Habsburg Low Countries), and, then, from 1511, of Anne of Brittany (wife of Louis XII of France).\footnote{Jodogne, Jean Lemaire de Belges, pp. 320-43 (‘La légende des Vénitiens’) and 344-57 (‘Histoire moderne de Syach Ismail, dit Sophy Arduelin’); Jean Lemaire de Belges, \emph{Traicté de la différance des schismes et des conciles de l’église avec l’Histoire du Prince Sophy et autres œuvres}, ed. J. Britnell (Geneva, 1997).} Nowadays best known for his \emph{Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye} (printed in three volumes between 1511 and 1513),\footnote{J. Kem, Jean Lemaire de Belges, Les Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye. The Trojan Legend in the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance (New York etc., 1994).} his contemporaries, particularly in the Burgundian Low Countries, regarded him as an important author of French poetry and prose, and of polemical tracts.\footnote{J. Kem, Jean Lemaire de Belges, Les Illustrations de Gaule et singularitez de Troye. The Trojan Legend in the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance (New York etc., 1994).} Jan, however, was probably drawn to
Lemaire primarily because of his position as official ‘historiographe’ to the Habsburg court. The two works of his which he used were written under patronage of Margaret of Austria: *La légende des Vénitiens* and *l’Histoire du prince Sophy*, both short French prose treatises (with some additional poetry) on contemporary history.

From the first of these, an anti-Venetian pamphlet in defence of the policies of Maximilian I, based principally on Latin sources from Italy (including Biondo’s *Decades* and Piccolomini’s *Cosmographia*), Jan took a small number of historical details to supplement his other sources. He made more extensive use of the second tract, *Histoire du prince Sophy*, an account of the career of the first Safavid shah, Ismail I, providing an almost complete translation, lacking only the introduction and conclusion. As he did with Froissart, Jan translates the French literally, often verbatim; but he distances the authorial voice from his own by referring to Lemaire in passages of direct speech.

Interestingly, despite his keenness to include material on heresies, Jan does not mention the work which usually precedes the *Histoire de Sophy* in printed editions: *Traicté de la différance des schismes et des conciles de l’église* (1511), in which Lemaire argued that Church councils were a necessity to counter the schismatic tendencies of the papacy. This suggests that Jan’s inclusion of an argument for Conciliarism earlier in the chronicle may not have been purposeful. It has been claimed that the *Histoire* and the *Traicté* should be seen together, as a prophetic call to Christian kings, encouraging them not to be distracted by Pope Julius II from their task of fighting

---

528 References at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 322r, 353v, 355v, 358r, 359v.
530 Ibid., pp. xviii-xxxiii.
531 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 322r, 359v.
532 Ibid., fols 353v-356v, from Jean Lemaire de Belges, *Histoire du Prince Sophy*, in his *Le traictie intitulé de la difference des scismes et des concilles de leglise* (Paris, n. d.), sigs i1v-k1r. The description of the sects of Islam (sig. i1r-v) is omitted here (fol. 354r-v), but inserted later on (fol. 356v).
533 See above, p. 98, n. 394.
534 Cf., e.g., Lemaire de Belges, *Histoire*, sig. i4v (Lemaire de Belges, *Traicté*, ed. Britnell, p. 257): ‘Celui de qui j’ay translaté une partie de ceste histoire d’ytalien en françois, escrivant au duc moderne de Venise ...’, with MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 355v: ‘die ghene die dese histori seijt meester jan meijer van beges in ijtaliaenss ouer ghescreuen heeft an den hartoch van venegijen ... daer jcks een deel van ouer gheset heb wt ijtaliaenss in franssoijs ...’.
537 See above, p. 114.
the Turks. Jan valued the *Histoire* instead for its historical and ethnographic account of the Safavids, as well as its description of the sects of Islam – the divide between Sunni and Shi’i was much on the minds of European Christians, who hoped the Safavids might prove to be an ally against the Turks. Jan takes over Lemaire’s observation that the Grand Turk was in fear of Ismail; but he does not attempt to formulate such an argument and ignores the ample opportunities to do so provided by his sources. It looks as if he was less inspired by an apocalyptic world view than by genuine curiosity about (and perhaps also fear of) the exotic.

**Poggio Bracciolini, *Epistola de morte Hieronymi Pragensis***

In 1414, a general Council of the Church was convened in Constance, with three central aims: to end the Western Schism; to eradicate several heresies, particularly those of John Wyclif in England and of John Hus and Jerome of Prague in Bohemia; and to bring about a moral reform of the Church. A short account of the Council was included in the continuation to the ‘Dutch Beke’, which Jan copied into his chronicle; but he then assembled a much longer account from various other sources, including Antoninus and Foresti. He also included a Dutch version of Poggio’s letter to Leonardo Bruni about the trial and execution of Jerome of Prague, translated from the Latin original – possibly the oldest extant complete Dutch translation of a Latin text by an Italian humanist author. In the letter, Poggio praised Jerome’s eloquence and oratorical

---

539 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 356v, from Lemaire de Belges, *Histoire*, sig. i1r-v.
541 Documentary Appendix 1, title 11: ‘Pogius in sijn epistelen’. Reference at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 220r.
543 Beke, *Croniken*, p. 312 (§28, ll. 24-44); MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 223v.
546 The Dutch version of Piccolomini’s *De duobus amantibus*, mentioned by Jan, is lost; see above, p. 117, n. 522. Petrarca’s *Griseis* had been published in Dutch, but in a translation from an intermediary French source: C. Ypes, *Petrarca in de Nederlandse letterkunde* (Amsterdam, 1934), pp. 19-24; see also B. H. Molkenboer, ‘Invloed van de Italiaansche letteren op de onze tot 1600’, *De Beiaard* 2 (1917), pp. 273-94.
powers, which led Bruni to warn him that he should be more careful in his comments about a convicted heretic. The same could have been said of Jan’s version:

It is astonishing how sensibly he defended himself, and with which arguments – he spoke no different from a Christian. If he had such faith as he testified with his mouth, one would not rightly find a cause for death in him, nor even the smallest heretical article. He said it was all falsehood and embalmed by his enemies and persecutors. ... He began to tell about all those who, for no fault of their own, have suffered unjustly in this world, starting with the pagans: about the imprisonment of Plato, about the flight of Anaxagoras and about Zeno’s suffering, and about Rupilius’s exile and wanderings ... . Then he came to John the Baptist and our Saviour, how He found death through falsehood, as everyone knew well ... . They all stood there expecting him to purge himself and to retract the things he had been charged with, or that he would desire pardon for his errors. But he said that he had not erred and that he did not want to retract the false lies of others ... . And he was willing to suffer any death they would give him for whatever he was falsely accused of ... . All who were present there felt great sadness. They desired to preserve such an erudite man if he had admitted to his error, but he remained of his opinion and he said that he had not opposed the state of the Holy Church but the arrogance, pomposity, immorality, greed and gluttony of the religious and prelates ... . He had a sweet and proper diction. He stood fearless and intrepid, not spurning but desiring death, you would have thought him another Cato ... . But when he stubbornly persisted in his error, he was sentenced by the council to be burned. He faced death with a happy and cheerful countenance, and did not fear the fire. When he came to the place where he would die, he took off his clothes himself, and with bent knees he saluted the stake to which he was bound. And when the fire was lit he began to sing a hymn, which neither smoke nor fire could prevent. In this way the devout champion (apart from his religious convictions) ended his life.
Poggio’s letter was translated into Italian and German in the late fifteenth century, and it was published in a number of incunabula editions; but it became particularly popular in the Reformation as a set-piece of anti-Catholic propaganda. Jan’s translation of the letter, however, predates the beginning of the Reformation, if only by a couple of years. It was occasionally found printed and bound together with works by Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, including his Cosmographia, another of Jan’s sources; and he may have consulted it in such an edition.

Jan’s version of the letter, the only known translation into Dutch, omits the opening sentences directed to the recipient, Leonardo Bruni, but otherwise renders the entire text, with only minor omissions and clarifications. There is no indication that he attempted to make it more critical of the convicted heretic; if anything, his version is more favourable towards Jerome of Prague, and it amplifies his reported attack on the clergy.

Rather than interpreting these alterations as signs of an increasingly critical

heeft met gheuouwen knijen die pael gheeert daer hij an ghebonden wart Ende na dattet vuijer ontsteken was begian hij een jimmern te singhen het dwelc die roeck noch vuijer hem naw en hebben moghen benemen In deser manieren heeft die vrome campioen behaluen het gheloeff sijn leven gheeijnt’.

C. B. Smith, ‘A Fifteenth Century Italian Translation of Poggio’s Letter on Jerome of Prague’, Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte 58 (1967), pp. 5-15; however, the earliest German translation, by Nicolaus von Wyle was not, as Smith claims (p. 5, n. 2), from c. 1521 (when it was printed separately: Poggio Bracciolini, Wie Hieronymus von Prag ain anhänger Johannis Huss durch das concilium zu Costentz für ain ketzer verurtailt vnd verpreint worden ist, vnd wie er sich zu sterben beraht hat [n.p., 1521]), for it had already been printed in Wyle, Translationen, c. 1478 (no. 11, fols 150v-156v). See also L. W. Spitz, ‘The Course of German Humanism’ in H. A. Oberman and T. A. Brady (eds), Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations (Leiden, 1975), pp. 371-436, at 392, for the role played by the Council of Constance in the early dissemination of humanism in Germany; see p. 394 for Wyle.

It is independent of Nicolaus von Wyle’s translation, as phrases in the Latin are rendered differently in the Dutch and the German translations, both relying directly on the Latin: e.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 221v, ‘het gheestick goet’; where Wyle, Translationen, fol. 155r, has ‘der kirchen vätterlich erbgůte’; both from the Latin ‘ecclesiarum patrimonia’.

E.g., London, British Library, shelfmark 568.d.32, a combined print of Piccolomini’s Cosmographia and Poggio’s letter (also including Bohemicae Historiae); for the letter, see sigs xx1r-xx4r.

E.g., omission, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 221r: ‘mede van rupilijus banninck ende verdrift’, omitting the last part of Bracciolini, Epistola, sig. xx2v: ‘Rutilii exilium, Boethii simul et aliorum, quos Boethius refert indigna morte oppressorum commemoravit’; clarification, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 221v: ‘johannes hus (het dwelc sijn mede ghesel was gheweest in den gheloue ende om dat hij sijn ongheloeff nijet en woude off staen was hij te voren verbrant gheweest in dit consilium)’ (my emphasis), added to Bracciolini, Epistola, sig. xx3r.

E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 221r, ‘In deser manieren heeft die vrome campioen behaluen het gheloeff sijn leven gheeijnt’, from Bracciolini, Epistola, sig. xx6r: ‘Hoc modo ui reper fidem egregium concumptus est.’

E.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 221v: ‘die houaerdicheijt pomposicheijt oncuuijseijt ghijericheijt ende gulsicheijt der gheestelicheijt ende prelaten’, expanded from Bracciolini, Epistola, sig. xx3r: ‘adversus abusus clericorum, adversus superbiam fastum et pompam prelatorum.’
attitude towards the Church in the run-up to the Reformation, we should probably see them as indicating that, in Jan’s experience, as in Poggio’s before him, it was still possible to praise a person’s good qualities, even when condemning his opinions – a distinction which would be much harder to make only a few years later, when religious polarization put an end to such delicate intellectual justifications of tolerance for dissenting views.

Paul Oskar Kristeller called for greater significance to be attached to vernacular translations of Italian humanist works and to the contexts in which such works appeared. According to him, translations, adaptations, commentaries and added introductions ‘not only show the interest and respect which foreign scholars had for the Italian humanists in general, but also indicate in many instances the reasons why they favoured a particular author or work’. 556 Unfortunately, Jan does not explain why he incorporated Poggio’s letter into his chronicle; but his use of the letter suggests that what interested him was the historical information it provided about the Council of Constance and the trial of Jerome of Prague.

The alterations he made to the letter also show that he was not insensitive to Poggio’s praise of Jerome’s oratorical powers. Humanism and its passion for rhetoric and eloquence had a strong enough appeal for Jan to enable him to cope with the complex ambiguities presented by Poggio’s laudatory characterization of Jerome. Only a few decades earlier, it would have been unimaginable for a Dutch vernacular writer to call a convicted heretic, as Jan did, a ‘devout champion (apart from his religious convictions)’. 557 His use of Poggio’s letter suggests that, by the second decade of the sixteenth century, the impact of Italian humanism had reached beyond a small coterie of specialist scholars and that interest in humanist ideas had been instilled in a wider group of well-educated ‘laymen’, who had been schooled too early to reap the benefit of the educational reforms promoted by the Northern humanists, 558 but whose enthusiasm for at least certain aspects of the movement had been aroused by the activities of their erudite contemporaries.

557 See above, n. 554. If anything, Middle Dutch authors were generally more aggressively hostile towards heretics, pagans, Jews and muslims than their foreign sources: see, e.g., W. Kuiper, ‘Die Destructie van Jherusalem in handschrift en druk’, Voortgang. Jaarboek voor de neerlandistiek 25 (2007), pp. 67-88, esp. 76-7.
558 The humanist reform of secondary education in the Low Countries was not completed until 1520: Bot, Humanisme, pp. 40-42.
Willem Hermans, *Olandie Gelrieque bellum* 559

The first edition of the *Olandie Gelrieque bellum* of Willem Hermans is generally believed to have been printed in 1517; if so, Jan would have to have consulted it in manuscript. This dating, however, should be reconsidered. 560 Jan’s use of this work provides circumstantial evidence that the edition was already in print at the time he wrote the relevant section of his chronicle, that is, early 1514 at the latest: 561 not only did he have access to the overwhelming majority of his sources in print, but also, as we shall see, his information about Hermans is so unreliable that it seems unlikely he can have known much about him through any avenues other than works available in print. 562

Hermans’s work was the only one of Jan’s sources in which he could have encountered the term ‘insula Batavorum’ for Holland, 563 a humanist invention which had come into vogue among Erasmus’s circle by this date, 564 but which had not yet spread beyond this select group of scholars. Since Hermans employed and explained the phrase in a chapter of his history which Jan did not draw on, we cannot be certain how he reacted to it. In any case, for Jan, the work’s value for Jan was not its new learning, but its new historical information, unavailable in his other sources, specifically about a small number of sieges during the wars between Guelders and Holland in 1506–7. 565

---

559 Documentary Appendix 1, title 19: ‘Wilhelmus van der goude int oerloch van onse landen ende den ghelres’. Reference at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 351r.

560 The date c. 1517, was first suggested in E. W. Moes and C. P. Burger Jr, *De Amsterdamse boekdrukkers en uitgevers in de zestiende eeuw*, 4 vols (Amsterdam, 1900-15), II, pp. 379-83, no. 712. This dating is based on a reference to Hermans’s work in a seventeenth-century list of historians of the Netherlands in W. van Gouthoeven, *D’oude chronijcke ende historien van Holland*, 2 vols (Dordrecht, 1620), I, ‘Lijste van de Latijnsche ende Duytsche Historie oft Chronijk-schrijvers van Hollandt, Zeelandt, ende van Wrecht’ (following table of contents and errata), but it derives from a misreading of a passage which itself appears to be erroneous; Gouthoeven, in fact, wrote: ‘Broeder Willem Hermansz. vander Goude, Monic Regulier te Steyn, eertijts daer b'gy ghelegen, heeft een cleyn Boecxken beschreven van de Oorloghe tusschen Hertoghe Karel van Ghelder ende de Steden van Hollant t'synen tijde, te weten An. 1517. ende is ontrent die tijt t’Aemsteldam ghedruckt.’ As Hermans died in 1510 (see Leijenhorst, ‘Willem Hermans’), this description cannot be correct. Moreover, the date refers to the war which is subject of the chronicle (and therefore appears to be a misprint for 1507); all Gouthoeven says about the edition is that it was printed around the same time, indicating that he had no specific information. That the printed text contains errors which suggest a lack of authorial control by no means rules out the possibility that it was printed during the author’s lifetime, as is claimed by Nijhoff and Kronenberg, *Nederlandsche bibliographie*, no. 1037.

561 See above, p. 76, n. 284.


563 Hermans, *Olandie Gelrieque bellum*, sigs d2v-d3r.

564 See below, Chapter 3, pp. 188-191; Chapter 4, pp. 246-252.

565 Hermans, *Olandie Gelrieque bellum*, sigs b2r-b3v, ‘De oppugnatione oudewatera’, at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 351r-v; sigs b3v-b4r, ‘De proditione Scoenhouie deprehensa’, at fols 351v-352r; then continued to ‘De expugnatione Wesopi’, sig. c3r, in much abbreviated form, at fols 352v-353r.
Biographical Sources

While hagiography is absent from Jan’s list of sources, he did consult a number of biographical works. As we have seen, he did not consult first-hand the classical texts which he mentions in the context of the life of Julius Caesar. He did, however, take material directly from five other works, representing several different kinds of contemporary literary vitae – a romance of a French crusader prince, a legend of a local countess, a life of an illustrious woman and a humanist biography of an Italian lord – which enabled him to enliven his chronicle with exciting narratives.

‘The Life of Jean Tristan’

Jean Tristan (1250–70) was a son of King Louis IX of France. Born in Damietta while his father had been a captive in Egypt, he became Count of Nevers and married Yolande, granddaughter of the duke of Burgundy. Jean died at the age of twenty, during the Eighth Crusade. His exotic beginnings and end, his relative obscurity and his connection to St Louis made him the perfect target for the accumulation of epic narrative elements. Kidnapped by Saracens at an early age, he grew up at the Sultan’s court and eventually led a Saracen army into Italy where he (unknowingly) fought against his own uncle. A birthmark in the form of a crucifix led to the discovery of his true identity, after which he switched sides and went on a crusade, during which he was captured. He subsequently fell in love with a Saracen princess and was crucified after a failed attempt at escape, only to be rescued in the nick of time and to defeat the princess’s father and convert him to Christianity, finally becoming ruler of Tarsus. By the 1470s, the legend was most commonly known in a version included in the Livre de Baudouin de Flandres, and it was this version which got into print. Different versions, however, were also found in other works, and Jan’s reference to it by the title the ‘Legend of Jean Tristan’ suggests he

See above, p. 106, n. 449.

Documentary Appendix 1, title 29: ‘jnt leuen van johan tristan’.


may have read it in another source, or in an unknown edition or translation (there is no evidence of a Dutch version).  

The romance of Jean Tristan presented Jan with a dilemma, since it conflicted with the information in his chronicle sources or, at least, was not confirmed by them. If so much was known about the eventful life of the illustrious young prince, why were French historians so reticent? Jan’s passion for exciting stories encouraged him to include the story; but because he was anxious about its veracity, he gave only a concise, one-page version. He then concluded:

I would have set this out much more extensively, but I do not find it written in Latin, and also the learned Gaguin, who has very eloquently written the chronicle of France (at the end of which Erasmus, whom I mentioned in the prologue, has written a wonderful letter in which he greatly praises Gaguin for his labour and calls him a credit to the French), writes in his chronicle of France that this Jean Tristan, Count of Nevers, died from the plague when King Louis was in the kingdom of Tunis ... . For this reason, I do not know [whether I] should [believe] it, because one [should always] believe and pay attention to scholars. Nevertheless, I [have] read [the story] in several French books, and every [one of these was] written by a master and historian.

Due to the damaged state of the manuscript, we cannot be certain as to what precisely Jan was saying about the relationship between Latin and French sources; but it is clear that he contrasted the two with regard to their reliability and preferred Latin accounts to French ones. He did not, however, dismiss French sources per se, as his illustrious predecessor Jacob van Maerlant had famously done. Maerlant had felt the need to distance his own work from the French literary tradition, quite possibly because he was in direct

571 G. H. M. Claassens, De Middelnederlandse kruisvaartromans (Amsterdam, 1993), an exhaustive survey of the relationship between French and Dutch crusader romances, does not mention a Dutch version; see pp. 89-90, 96 for the legend. It is not found in any of Jan’s other Dutch sources, including the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’ and the ‘Dutch Beke’, nor among the chapbooks listed in Debaene, Nederlandse volksboeken.

572 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 66r.

573 Ibid., fol. 66r-v: ‘Dit soude ic v op lanxste vertoghen hebben mer want jcket nijet bescreuen en vinde int latijn Ende oec die gheleerde Gaguinus dewelc die cronijck van vrancrije zeer oratoerle bescreuen heeft (daer herasmus int proloech ghenoemt een heerliche epistel in bescreuen heeft int laste der hij dese gaguinum zeer in priejst van sijnen arbeijt ende noemt hem een eer der fransoijsen) dese bescrijft in sein cronijc van vrancrije dat dese jan tristan was graeff van niuers ghesturuen is van die pestelenci als coninc lodewijc int conincrijc van thunes lach ende rech[…….]euel ende loep Hijerom en weet je nijet […….]hen sal want die gheleerden is men s[…….]louen ende ghehoer te gheuen Nochtans heb ic […….] verscheijen walsche boecken ghelesen ende elcks […….] meester ende historiographus ghemaect’.

competition with it for the favour of his bilingual audience. We have seen that Jan saw his task not only as presenting a complete compilation of historical knowledge relevant to his chosen subject, but also as translating Latin scholarship on that subject into Dutch, and this aim, rather than any deep-rooted sense of historical criticism, may underlie his conclusion. At the same time, his doubts about what he had read in French romances concerning the life of Jean Tristan did not prevent him from including a brief summary of the legend in his chronicle – the story was simply too good to leave out.

‘The Chronicle of the Countess of Hennenberg’

In 1276, Margaret, Countess of Hennenberg, gave birth to 364 (some versions have 365) children. From soon after the countess’s death, the story of the marvellous birth, baptism and death of her children was recounted in many chronicles, differing in detail, but agreeing on the broad outline. The countess had accused a mother of twins of adultery, stating that the two children could not have been born from the same father, since this was impossible. The insulted mother cursed the countess, wishing her as many children as the number of days in a year. On Good Friday, at the ninth hour, the countess gave birth to the children and died soon after, as did all her offspring once they had been baptized. A commemorative plaque, telling the story in Dutch and in Latin, together with the two basins in which the children had been baptized, can still be seen on one of the walls of the abbey church of Loosduinen, where the countess and her children had been laid to rest.

In Jan’s version the countess gave birth to 364 children. He himself provided a theological explanation for the number:

---

575 Lie (ibid., p. 45) is right to argue that, when ‘fulminating against fake French poets, he is in fact criticising the category of vernacular poets who use oral (i.e. non-Latin [=unauthorized]) sources for their writings’; but, in my opinion, this does not explain the extent to which Maerlant engages specifically with the French literary tradition.

576 See also above, p. 117.

577 Documentary Appendix 1, title 34: ‘Wt die cronijck van der grauinnen van henne[ ]’. Two references at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 51r.


579 The church was destroyed in the sixteenth century; when it was restored in 1580, a new plaque was put up, replacing the earlier one: Hertog, Abdij, p. 147. For more on Jan’s possible use of this plaque, see n. 584 below.
It should be known that the curse which was made by that woman, or what she prayed would happen, was changed into a blessing in Lady Margaret, and, as a sign, Lady Margaret gave birth to many children, with God’s grace, but still one fewer than the days of a year, so that that woman would not pride herself that God had answered her prayer.\textsuperscript{580}

The story had been a stock narrative in chronicles, but Jan adds circumstantial details which are not found in any earlier version. Some of these appear to suggest a more intimate knowledge of the abbey and church of Loosduinen than that of his predecessors.\textsuperscript{581}

Jan’s first-hand knowledge of the comings and goings at the abbey of Loosduinen is also confirmed by a piece of local gossip which he tells elsewhere and which is not found in any other source. He correctly identifies a daughter of the Verdussen (van der Dussen) family as abbess in the period in question:\textsuperscript{582}

They are now of good regiment and life, and have a very good abbess, who is a daughter of the Verdussen family. She has had a little undeserved setback and tribulation due to the rebelliousness of one of her young ladies, who with her lies has brought great shame on the abbey. She is now in a different abbey. May God grant that she improves and lives a better life than she has done in two abbeys from which she departed with a scandal! I think she is a devil’s breed, because it always pleases him to depart with a stench. But we humans learn by trial and error, and we should judge no one, it says in the Gospel. And this happened in 1512.\textsuperscript{583}

\textsuperscript{580} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 51v: ‘Nochtan is te weten dat die maledicie die dat vrouken gaff off badt te ghescien in vrou margrijet voerscreuen is verwandelt in benedixien Ende tot een litteijken soe bracht vrou margrijet ter werlt bij goeds gracien voel kinderen nochtans een min dander daghen int jaer sijn op dattet vrouken haer nijet en soude beromen dat god hoer bede hadt verhoert’.

\textsuperscript{581} Of the different recorded versions, Jan’s most closely resembles one which must have circulated at the abbey; see Hertog, \textit{Abdij}, pp. 145-8. Among other things, Jan corrects the mistaken identification of the countess as ‘Mechteld’, correctly claiming that she was called Margaret (cf. Beke, \textit{Croniken}, p. 119 [cap. 65]; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 51v: ‘Johannes van […]ke seijt in sijn cronijc dat die grauinne van henneberch mechtelt […]ghenoemt ghelijc jc voerscreuen heb mer die cronijck die van hoer […]ect noemts margrijet’). The details given by Jan about the situation at Loosduinen can generally be confirmed by other sources: Hertog, \textit{Abdij}, pp. 114-15, 390-91, nn. 23, 24, 26. But see below, n. 585, for additional evidence for a written source about the church.

\textsuperscript{582} Hertog, \textit{Abdij}, pp. 351-3: Katharina van der Dussen was abbess 1509-38.

\textsuperscript{583} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 52r: ‘Sij sijn nu van zeer goeden regemente ende leuen ende hebben een zeer goede abdisse ende is een dochter van die verdussen Sij heeft nu een weijnich weerstoets gehad ende tribulaci ouermits die rebelleijt van een van hoer joffrouwen die den cloester grote scande an heeft ghescaen met loghenen ende onverdijt ende is nu in een ander clooster god gheeff dat sij hoer beteren moet ende bet moet leuen dan sij in tweek cloesteren ghescaen heeft daer sij met scanden wt is ghesceijen Ic denck sij van duuels gheslacht is want die scheijt altijt gaern met een stanc Mer wij sijn menschen vallen ende opstaen ende njemant en horen wij te veroerdelen ghelijce bescreuen staet int heijlighe ewangelium Ende dit is ghesciet jnt jaer ons heren M ccccc ende xij’.
Nevertheless, despite his apparent familiarity with the church of Loosduinen, Jan’s knowledge was at least partly bookish. He refers to a ‘chronicle’ of the countess of Hennenberg from which he took his account, and his transcriptions of epitaphs on gravestones in the church of Loosduinen are copied from an intermediary Latin source.

The story of the marvellous birth of the Countess of Hennenberg’s children is one of the few episodes in the medieval history of the Dutch Low Countries referred to by Erasmus. In his *Commentary on Ovid’s Nut Tree*, finished in 1523 and dedicated to Thomas More, he writes, in a discussion of multiple births:

Dutch chroniclers and even monuments, however, record that one woman, in a single birth, produced 365 live babies, all of which were baptized. There are chronicles to witness it; there is a monument, inscribed with the name; there is even a picture. It was a count of Holland that did it – seigneurs of these days were satisfied with such slight authority! You can still see the hill on which he used to have his castle, near to the monastery where the woman is buried. Do we wonder, then, that clever men have been able to persuade an uneducated world to believe in various absurdities, when such stories were credited by simple people in uneducated times? But there is little harm in such matters – similar techniques, however, have spread other beliefs, which have almost extinguished Christianity here.
The passage is of interest because Jan’s account is the only recorded version of the story which mentions the hill in the way described by Erasmus, whose phrase, ‘you can still see the hill on which he used to have his castle’, is quite similar to Jan’s, ‘you can still today see a high hill where the castle and fortress used to stand’. Of course, Erasmus did not read Jan’s account; and even if he had, he would not have made this obscure chronicle the brunt of his sarcasm. What it reveals, instead, is the distance between Jan’s mindset, which was that of a typical late medieval historian, and the intellectual programme of the humanists surrounding Erasmus, in which, for all his admiration, Jan had no hope of participating.

**Giovanni Simonetta, *Commentarii rerum gestarum Francisci Sfortiae***

Jan’s final biographical source was a propagandistic history of the career of Francesco Sforza (1401–1466), written in the 1470s. Giovanni Simonetta’s *Commentarii rerum gestarum Francisci Sfortiae* was ‘the first and most important humanist history to emerge from Milan in the fifteenth century’, written by a prominent bureaucrat of the Sforza apparatus. Although it became one of the central sources to later city chronicles of Milan, its central aim was to present an apologetic and glorifying account of the life of its duke and a justification for his claim to that title. As far as I have been able to ascertain, apart from Jan’s use of the work, it had no other influence in the Dutch Low Countries during the early sixteenth century; there were no translations into Dutch, and no local editions.

---


589 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 51r: ‘daermen noch een hoghe werff sijen mach daert casteel ende slot ghestaen heeft’.

590 Documentary Appendix 1, title 18: ‘Johannes sijmoneta int leuen van franciscus phorcia hartoch van milanen’. Reference at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 270v.

Jan took most of his information about Sforza and Milan from Antoninus and Foresti, borrowing only one episode from Simonetta’s *Commentarii*. Unlike many apologetic works – including others about the Sforzas – Simonetta’s was ‘grounded in a full comprehension of political and military realities’. Nevertheless, it was still highly rhetorical; and Jan selected a particularly rhetorical narrative for his chronicle: an account of Sforza’s rescue of a beautiful young woman in the captured town of Casanova from certain rape by his soldiers – and even, after her pleas, from what Jan refers to as Sforza’s own ‘Venus work’. He concludes the account with an addition to his source: ‘Livy, in his *Decades*, describes how Scipio Africanus did a similar thing [when] he had conquered the city of Carthage.’

Although Simonetta did not mention Livy’s account of the ‘continence of Scipio’, he surely intended his readers to recognize the portrayal of Francesco Sforza as a present-day Scipio. It is doubtful, however, whether Jan’s explicit reference was based on first-hand knowledge of Livy’s *Ab Urbe condita*. He certainly could have had access to the work, which had been available in print since 1469 and which had been printed under the title *Decades*, used by him, more than twenty times by 1500, and frequently after that date, not only in Latin, but also in Italian, Spanish and French. A more likely source, however, and one we know that Jan consulted, was the *Chronicon* of Antoninus, in which the story of Scipio’s continence is recounted, giving Livy as the source. Nonetheless, Jan deserves some credit for spotting Simonetta’s implicit allusion to Livy.

---

592 See above, pp. 104, 109.

593 Ianziti, ‘*Commentaries*’, p. 84.


595 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 271v: ‘Deser ghelijcken bescrijft liuius in sijn decades dat scipio affricanus oeck ghedaen heeft [… ] hij die machtighe stat van cartagen hadde gewonnen’.


597 Goff L236-54, GW M18525.

598 Antoninus Florentinus, *Opus*, I, fol. 60r (iii.v.xvi).
Martial d’Auvergne, *Les vigilles de la mort de Charles VII*; Jacobus Philippus Foresti Bergomensis, *De claris mulieribus*

The starting-point for Jan’s three-page description of the martyrdom of Joan of Arc is Gaguin, to whom he refers for the date. Afterwards, he relies on Martial d’Auvergne’s French historical poem *Les vigilles de la mort de Charles VII* for an account of Joan’s career. This story had long been controversial, and the role of the Burgundians in her martyrdom was far from disinterested; but, by the later fifteenth century, her life was universally accepted as exemplary. The attraction for Jan may have been the question of Joan’s heretical image and the eventual confirmation of her orthodoxy, since he devotes most space to this question rather than to the political implications of her martyrdom. It is in this context that he draws on a third work, Jacobus Philippus Foresti Bergomensis’s *De claris mulieribus*, a collection of Latin lives of famous women, which Jan treats as an historical source but which was, in reality, a faithful adaptation, with a devout slant, of Boccaccio’s work of the same title, with additions, including Joan’s *vita*, by Foresti himself.

---

599 Documentary Appendix 1, title 28: ‘Meester marciael int leuen van coninck kaerl die vij’.
601 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 258v: ‘BInnent leuen van vrou jacob voerscreuen als jnt […] M cccc xxviii soe isser een maecht gheweest […] johanna ghenoemt (als bescrijft robertus gagwijnus […] wt loreijnen’.
604 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 259v-260r, from Jacobus Philippus Foresti Bergomensis, *De plurimis claris ... mulieribus* (Ferrara, 1497), fols 144v-145v (‘Janna gallica pulcella’).
Fig. 13: London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 165v: Countess Margaret of Holland

©The British Library Board. All rights reserved.
Reproduced with financial support of the University of London Central Research Fund.
Fig. 14: London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 25r: Count Dirk I receiving the county

©The British Library Board. All rights reserved.
Reproduced with financial support of the University of London Central Research Fund.
Fig. 15: London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 54v: Count Willem II, emperor-elect

©The British Library Board. All rights reserved. Reproduced with financial support of the University of London Central Research Fund.
Jan lists among his sources ‘other poems and privileges’. Even though the reference comes under Dutch works, the ‘poems’ might well include transcriptions of Latin epitaphs from tombstones and grave monuments such as those at Loosduinen. As for the ‘privileges’, there is only one document in the chronicle which Jan did not copy from his narrative sources: the privilege Empress Margaret granted to her subjects in Holland in 1346. It did not appear in any of the Dutch chronicles used by Jan; and his inclusion of the document indicates the significance he attributed both to it and to the person who issued it.

To understand the function which Margaret’s privilege performs in Jan’s chronicle, we need to take into account her place in the history of Holland. The most important political issue influencing Jan’s chronicle concerned the disputes between the so-called Hoeken (‘Hooks’) and Kabeljauwen (‘Cods’), a long-lasting conflict between ever-changing coalitions from the leading families and the citizenry of Holland which occasionally descended into civil war. The antagonism between the two parties first erupted in the mid-fourteenth century, over the disputed succession of Count Willem IV, when a coalition mostly consisting of citizenry, the Kabeljauwen, supported Willem V against the claims of his mother, Margaret, whose partisans mainly came from the old noble families of the county, the Hoeken. The disputes were finally settled in the favour of the party of the Kabeljauwen in the last decades of the fifteenth century; but Jan’s chronicle reveals that resentment was still felt among the offspring of the losers a generation later.

From the start of his account of the conflict, Jan shows his colours as a partisan of the Hoeken. He begins with a full-page image, displaying the arrival of Margaret, wife of...

---

606 Documentary Appendix 1, title 33: ‘Wt noch andere ghedichten ende priuilegijen’.
607 See above, p. 128.
608 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 170v-172r; F. van Mieris, Groot Charterboek der Graaven van Holland, van Zeeland, en Heeren van Vriesland ... , 4 vols (Leiden, 1753-6), II, pp. 712-14; although the addressees in Jan’s version are the people of Holland, his date is that of the nearly identical privilege to the people of Kennemerland, pp. 710-11.
610 T. Porck, ‘Een Rijnlandse serie adelshandelingen (1533-1542). Het zogenaamde “Voorste Haagse Handschrift”’, Millennium. Tijdschrift voor middeleeuwse studies 1 (2006), pp. 44-62, at 46-7, argues that neither the decreasing influence of the regional nobility in the Dutch Low Countries (cf. J. Romein, Geschiedenis van de Noord-Nederlandse geschiedschrijving in de middeleeuwen: bijdrage tot de beschavingsgeschiedenis [Haarlem, 1932], pp. 212-14), nor the partisan disputes can be held responsible for the late-fifteenth century production of chronicles of noble families. Despite the broad scope of Jan’s chronicle, his historiographical aims were clearly influenced by his family’s loss of power and coloured by their partisan views.
Emperor Louis IV of Bavaria, in Holland, holding in her hand a document, possibly intended to represent the privilege granted to her subjects in the county (Fig. 13). Among the five illustrations in the chronicle, two others are images of counts: Dirk I, the first count, likewise holding a document, this time the deeds granting him possession of the county (Fig. 14); and Willem II, emperor-elect (Fig. 15). These were the two most illustrious rulers in the history of Holland; so, by devoting a third illustration to Margaret, Jan made clear that he considered her on a par with her predecessors and a rightful heir to the county. The two documents shown in the images highlight the official relationship of Dirk I and Margaret to the county and, in Margaret’s case, it reinforces her claims to sovereignty.

Her position is given further support by Jan’s alterations to his sources. The heading of the chapter in the ‘Dutch Beke’ on the disputed succession was ambiguous about the claims of Margaret, the champion of the Hoeken, to the county. In all the other references to counts and countesses in these chapter headings, their title is given along with their name; but in this heading, the title is left out: ‘About Empress Margaret, the twentieth of Holland.’ Jan, however, makes a point of spelling out her claims: ‘About Margaret, empress of Rome and duchess of Bavaria, who was Count Willem’s oldest sister, and became countess of Holland’. Removing any remaining doubts, Jan writes, after taking over the chapter from the ‘Dutch Beke’: ‘she was this count’s oldest sister, and therefore she was the rightful heir of Hainault and Holland, Zealand and Friesland’. Margaret is never referred to as countess in the ‘Dutch Beke’; instead, she is said to have conferred the county on her son, Willem V, and then to have left for Bavaria. Jan omits this sentence, replacing it with another one from the ‘ Chronicle of Gouda’, whose author’s sympathies also lay with the Hoeken, stating that: ‘Margaret, duchess of Bavaria,

611 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 165v.
612 Ibid., fol. 25r: Dirk I; fol. 54v: Willem II.
613 E.g., Beke, Croniken, p. 183 (cap. 80): ‘Van Willam den xix. grave van Hollant’.
614 Beke, Croniken, p. 192 (cap. 82): ‘Van Margrieten der keyserinnen, die xx. van Hollant’.
615 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 165r: ‘Van mergrijet keijserinne van romen ende hartoghinne van beijeren ende was graeff willem outste suster Dese wart grauinne van hollant’ (addition in italics).
616 Ibid., fol. 165v: ‘Want sij des seluen outste suster was waerom [..] recht erffghenaem was van henegouwen hollant zeelant [..] van vrieslant’.
617 Beke, Croniken, p. 193 (cap. 82): ‘Ende daerna beval se hertoghe Willam horen sone die graefscap van Hollant te berichten ende toech weder in Beieren’.
became countess of Hainault, Holland and Zealand, and mistress of Friesland, which lands she governed judiciously for five years.'

This is the political context in which we find the full text of the privilege granted by Margaret to her subjects in Holland, which he says that he ‘found set out in an old book’. The claim to have discovered evidence, unavailable in the most authoritative histories, in an ‘old book’ had been an historiographical *topos* since at least Geoffrey of Monmouth; in Jan’s case, however, the claim appears to be genuine. Since the privilege is the only documentary source which he cites, it is unlikely that he obtained it by means of archival research. His access to the document suggests, instead, that it was still in circulation, even among families of the lower nobility such as Jan’s branch of the Naaldwijks, a century and a half after it was written, no doubt because of its polemical potential as a propaganda tool for the party of the Hoeken, confirming Margaret’s status as the rightful and just ruler of Holland.

619 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 166r, following ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. k5r: ‘Dese keijserinne mergriet hertoghinne van beijeren wart grauinne van henegouwen hollant van zeelant ende vrouwe van vrieslant welcke landen sij wijslicken regierde vijff jaer lang’.

620 Ibid., fol. 166r, ‘welcke priuilegien ende hantuesten jc hijer na noch bescriuen sal die je bescreuen ghevonden hebbe in een out boexken’, added to Beke, *Croniken*, p. 193 (cap. 82); the privilege is mentioned at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 170v-172r, after Jan takes over Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 192-3 (cap. 83).

Fig. 16: London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 49r: The Mountain of Fortune

©The British Library Board. All rights reserved.
Reproduced with financial support of the University of London Central Research Fund.
UNHISTORICAL HISTORIES: ANECDOTES

As we have seen again and again, Jan’s additions to his Dutch sources, when not inspired by historical developments concerning the counts or the county of Holland, were often based on their entertainment value as exciting narratives. Some of this material was only very tenuously connected, if at all, to the subject of his chronicle. Given his fondness for such material, it is hardly surprising that he was attracted to the popular late medieval genre of story collections, or exempla. As with his biographical sources, he drew on the various different types of exemplum available in his day – moral, farcical and religious.

Gesta Romanorum

The most famous collection of exempla, the Gesta Romanorum, was a compilation of tales supplied with extensive ‘moralizations’ – moralistic musings often longer than the story to which they were attached. Like other compilations of historical narratives, such as the Speculum historiale, the Gesta Romanorum provided exempla for sermons; but unlike the Speculum, the Gesta had no historical ambitions: its stories were not ordered chronologically and were presented as taking place in an unspecified era of kings and emperors. Jan found an opportunity to insert one of these tales back into history. It occurs in a passage to which he gives a title, setting it apart from the main text and signalling that it is of particular importance: ‘About two marvellous adventures: one of which Jan Beke recounts in his chronicle, and a part of the other is related in the Gesta Romanorum.’

The story begins with an account, taken from Beke, about the ‘Mountain of Fortune’ in the Holy Land, which was reported to provide good fortune to all those who climbed it after confession and communion; Wilbrand, Bishop of Paderborn (and later of Utrecht) visited the mountain, where he found plentiful food. Jan adds that he has heard of a

---

622 For the medieval genre of the exemplum and how it grew out of the practice of preaching in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the exempla collections of the thirteenth century and the added moralizations of the fourteenth century, see C. Bremond, J. Le Goff and J.-C. Schmitt, L’”exemplum”, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental, 40 (Turnhout, 1982), esp. pp. 50-66.

623 Documentary Appendix 1, title 8: ‘Die gesten ende historijen van romen’.

624 E.g., Gesta Romanorum, ed. H. Oesterley (Berlin, 1872), pp. 273-5 (cap. 1), 284-7 (cap. 8), 287-8 (cap. 10). They are often omitted in modern editions (e.g., M. Komroff (ed.), Tales of the Monks from the Gesta Romanorum [London, Bombay and Sydney, 1936]).

625 A practice which was ridiculed in Jan’s time by, among others, Erasmus, who mentions these two particular works in this context: Bejczy, Erasmus, p. 7, and references there.

626 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 48v: ‘Van twee wonderlicke auentueren daer johannes van der beke in sijn cronijck die een off vertelt ende jn die jesten van romen staet een deel vant ander bescreuen’.

627 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 48v, from Beke, Croniken, pp. 115-16 (cap. 64).
knight who found a purse with an endless supply of money there. On the next page, there is an illustration of the following account (Fig. 16), essentially taken over from the *Gesta Romanorum*; it is one of the two narratives from outside the historiographical tradition of Holland to be illustrated in Jan’s chronicle. The story was about another marvellous mountain, in England, where local hunters were always able to find refreshment from a servant, who appeared out of nowhere carrying a horn with an endless supply of wine. Jan’s retelling started with the words ‘Around this time…’, creating the impression that he had put the tale, said in the *Gesta* to have taken place in the time of an unspecified King Henry, in its proper chronological position.

Jan’s most significant addition to the story, however, concerned the location of the wondrous mountain: in his version the *Gesta*’s ‘in regno Anglie’ becomes ‘in England, in the forest of Northumberland’. A little further on, we learn why he placed the magic mountain in this particular location:

This is the forest which Merlin used to frequent, as one can read in the history of King Arthur, which I, Jan van Naaldwijk, translated from French into Dutch. This Merlin had come from an evil spirit and was given to a noble maid, but by being baptised he was taken away from the devil.

Jan’s associative mind led him to drift from the matter at hand to one of his earlier projects, allowing him to insert a digression on the conception of Merlin by an incubus, which had nothing at all to do with the events he was describing. Perhaps aware of this, Jan quickly returned to the main plot, and the remainder of his account is an accurate translation of the Latin *Gesta Romanorum* story, leaving out only the obligatory ‘moralization’.

---

628 *Gesta Romanorum*, pp. 541-2 (cap. 161); Jan’s version does not come from the Middle Dutch, *Gesten ofte croniken der romeynen* (Zwolle, 1484), sigs aa5v-aa6v (cap. 161).


630 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 49r: ‘in enghelant int foreest van noerthomberlant’.

631 Ibid.: ‘In dit foreest plach merlijn voel te verkeren ghelijc men bescreuen vinden mach in die histori van coninc artus die jc jan van naaldwijk ghetranslateert hebbe wt den walschen in duijths Dese merlijn was ghecomen van den bosen gheest ende ghemaect an eel joiffrou mer ouermits dat hij ghedoopt wert was hij den duuelen ontogh’en’.

632 See further below, pp. 153-154.
Poggio Bracciolini’s Facetiae, French translation by Guillaume Tardif

We have already encountered Jan’s translation of Poggio Bracciolini’s letter on the trial of Jerome of Prague. The presence of the Italian humanist at the Council of Constance gave Jan the excuse also to include a translation from another of Poggio’s works, the Facetiae, a widely read Latin collection of witty tales and anecdotes, written in the middle of the fifteenth century, even though it bore no relation to the events he set out in his chronicle.

The Facetiae were first printed c. 1470 and they were published again, soon afterwards, in Utrecht. Apart from this edition in the early 1470s, however, there is no evidence of further influence of the text in the Dutch Low Countries. Jan listed the Facetiae under his French sources, and the version he used was indeed the French translation by Guillaume Tardif, a friend of Robert Gaguin. In his translation, Tardif added a brief moral lesson at the end of each tale; he also had made a selection of 115 from Poggio’s original 273 facetiae, preferring the longer stories over the shorter jokes, as well as omitting tales which were more political than humorous and others which did not fall under a narrower definition of facetiae, such as marvels and wonders. Jan made a further selection, translating only twenty-two of Tardif’s 115 stories, including some obscene ones, though he preserved Tardif’s moral precepts.

---

633 Documentary Appendix 1, title 25: ‘Pogius in sijn facecijen’. References at MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 218v and 214r.
636 P. Koj, Die frühe Rezeption der Fazetien Poggios in Frankreich (Hamburg, 1969), p. 130 and n. 15.
637 Koj, Frühe Rezeption, p.125.
639 Judging from his table of contents, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 8v-9r, Jan translated Tardif’s facecies 11-13, 18, 39, 51, unidentified, 70, 71, 73, 79, 84, 85, 89-91, 94, 100, 101, 104, 112 and 113. Since Tardif’s facecie 100 is omitted in the editions B, C, and E, Jan must have used an early print similar or identical to edition A. See Tardif, Facecies, pp. 53-7, 303-10; Jan’s use of such a version can be seen as supporting evidence of an edition of Tardif’s translation before 1517; cf. ibid., pp. 53-4; P. Koj, Frühe Rezeption, p. 144-5.
640 See MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 214r, where the conclusion of Tardif’s facecie 113 is rendered almost verbatim: ‘Hijer in machmen mercken dat dije bespotters dicwijls vallen int net ende jn dije kuijl die sj voer een ander bereijt hadden ende een ander in mejinden te breghen’; Tardif, Facecies, p. 240: ‘En ceste facecie est monstré comme souvent les trompeurs cheent au latz de tromperie auquel ilz cuydent mettre aultruy, comme de raison est.’
Sadly, ten folios are now missing from the manuscript, including all but the start of the first tale and the conclusion of the final one. Apart from these two fragments, only the chapter headings for about twenty other tales remain. As far as can be judged from the surviving bits, Jan’s translation is faithful to Tardif’s French, occasionally omitting certain details, but for the most part following it almost word for word. The decision to remove the *facetiae* from the chronicle may have been made by Jan himself, perhaps after reconsidering the appropriateness of this material for a chronicle or with the aim of producing a self-contained booklet. Whatever the explanation, no trace remains of the first Dutch translation of Poggio’s *Facetiae*.

**Johannes Vitalis, *Defensorium Beatae Virginis Mariae***

The rather obscure treatise *Defensorium Beatae Virginis Mariae* of the Parisian Franciscan Johannes Vitalis was not printed in Jan’s own day, but he may have known it through an intermediary source or in a manuscript perhaps acquired while he was in Paris. Jan correctly dates the work to the final decades of the fourteenth century.
which may indicate that he found it embedded in a larger chronological framework.\textsuperscript{651}

The work is a defence of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, which was accepted by the Franciscans, but disputed by the Dominican Order. Johannes Vitalis (Jean Vital or Juan Vidal) – ‘a noisy, half-educated Franciscan’ from Spain\textsuperscript{652} – was commissioned by the University of Paris to compose a defence after a lecture in 1384 by a Dominican who had called for a censure of the University, which was dominated by Franciscans.\textsuperscript{653} In the work, he gives several accounts of miracles in which Dominicans are punished for their disbelief in the Immaculate Conception. A number of these stories were incorporated into the growing tradition of propagandistic texts supporting the doctrine.\textsuperscript{654} By the late fifteenth century, while the issue was still unresolved, most bishops accepted the doctrine.\textsuperscript{655} Jan’s inclusion of a small series of these stories may have been inspired by the material which immediately preceded it in his chronicle. In the description of the nations of Christianity,\textsuperscript{656} there was a reference to the Nestorians, who denied ‘that the Holy Virgin Mary was the mother of God, but [claimed she was only the mother] of a human, Jesus’.\textsuperscript{657}

\textsuperscript{650}MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 92v: ‘Binnent leuen van hartoch aelbert als jnt jaer ons here[…]’, i.e., 1358-1404.

\textsuperscript{651}E.g., a source similar to Tractatus auctoris anonymi de conceptione immaculata Beatissimae Virginis Genitrices Mariae, in Monumenta antiqua immaculatae conceptionis Sacratissime Virginis Mariae, ed. P. de Alva y Astorga (Leuven, 1664; facsimile Brussels, 1967), pp. 356-78, where, at 374-5, there are summaries of some of the same narratives from Johannes Vitalis which Jan includes, with reference to their source; differences in detail, however, rule out this text as Jan’s source. Alternatively, he may have deduced that it was written in this period from descriptions of the affair in other sources, e.g., Gaguin, Compendium, fol. 185r.


\textsuperscript{654}E.g., \textit{Tractatus auctoris anonymi}, pp. 374-5.


\textsuperscript{656}See above, pp. 114-114.

\textsuperscript{657}MS Vitellius F xv, fol. 91v: ‘Die […] sijn die nestorianen van nestorinus die ketter dewele is bis[…]tinebelen gheweest Dese stellen alleen in cristo twee personen […] ende die ander menslie ende sij versaeccken mariam die heijlighe […] te wesen die moeder goeds mer wel van een man ihesus […]’. 143
CONCLUSION: JAN VAN NAALDWIJK AND THE SOURCES OF HIS FIRST CHRONICLE OF HOLLAND

Several factors played a part in Jan’s expansion of the material traditionally found in chronicles of Holland and in the ways he appropriated his sources. The larger number of works available in his day, mainly due to the impact of the printing press, gave him access to sources which earlier chroniclers of the county had not been able to consult. Many of these sources provided him with additional information about persons or events which already featured in history writing about Holland. Partisan disputes of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries continued to exert an influence over his view of the county’s past and its present; and his opinions about these disputes had an impact on his narration of historical events and even on the choice of illustrations for his chronicle. Moreover, the changed geopolitical situation in which the county found itself led him to make significant adjustments not only to the narration of events close to his own time, but also to those recounted much earlier in the chronicle. Other information which he introduced probably reflects, first and foremost, Jan’s personal interests, which he shared with educated men of his time: rebellions, heresies, crusades; travel accounts and ethnographical information; entertaining anecdotes, exemplary and farcical narratives. The learning of Renaissance humanism also influenced this amateur historian, even if the core of his work remained solidly based on medieval traditions.

By exploring Jan’s idiosyncratic relation to his sources, it has been possible to identify the overlap of continuities and transformations in his chronicle. Looked at from this perspective, aspects of the literary culture of the time which have usually been perceived as innovations suddenly appear grounded in a long tradition of experimentation. We have encountered in Jan’s chronicle a far more complicated and personal balancing act than the stock images of a late medieval ‘autumn’ and a Renaissance ‘spring’ would suggest – an act which shows that, in dealing with the cultural produces of this period, it is as inappropriate to concentrate primarily on new and innovative characteristics as it is to focus exclusively on continuities.
PART III

Autobiographical Elements
in Jan van Naaldwijk’s First Chronicle of Holland

When investigating Jan’s use of his sources, we have occasionally seen how material circumstances influenced his writing. Whether he owned a copy of a particular text or read it in someone else’s library may have determined the extent to which he was able to draw on it; whether a text was already widely available in Dutch would have been a factor in his decision to include certain narratives. Moreover, elements of his experience outside the walls of his study – partisan resentment, family and personal loyalties, familiarity with local institutions – no doubt influenced his writing. The value of studying a chronicle like Jan’s lies, primarily, in unearthing the individual character of its author and the ways in which he balanced different aspects of his culture; it is, then, appropriate to conclude this chapter with an investigation of the impact of such ‘extraneous’ influences and of his own biography on his work as an historian.

ANECDOTES FROM JAN’S OWN EXPERIENCE

Even more out of step with the tradition of chronicle writing than Jan’s inclusion of anecdotal material from collections of exempla is his recounting of two anecdotes deriving from his own experience. The first of these anecdotes follows an account of the causes behind the murder of Count Floris V of Holland. Modern historians insist that it was Floris’s decision to shift his allegiance from England to France which sealed his fate, however, a second explanation of the murder, current from directly after the event until our own times in the popular imagination, is much more attractive: Floris had suggested to his friend and courtier Gerard van Velsen that he should marry his own (i.e.,

659 W. van Anrooij et al., Floris V door de edelen vermoord. Beeldvorming sedert 1296 (Leiden, 2002).
Floris’s) former mistress; Gerard had indignantly answered that he would never marry that prostitute – to which Floris responded that he would make any future wife of Gerard his own whore.\textsuperscript{660} Jan liked this story but was apparently troubled by the crude behaviour of the otherwise honourable count (‘to whom so many virtues have been ascribed’, he adds)\textsuperscript{661} – after all, it was his duty as a lord ‘to assist his servants in their rights and not to strive for their dishonour and shame’.\textsuperscript{662} To come to terms with the outlandish actions of the count, Jan argued that no doubt ‘the woman drove him to do this, for as Solomon writes, there is no man wise enough not to be deceived and beguiled by women when they exercise their dishonesty, character and depravity’.\textsuperscript{663}

Jan continues with a sentence that one does not expect to find in a chronicle: ‘I will tell you something similar, which once happened to me.’\textsuperscript{664} What follows is even more perplexing. The narrative reads like a typical medieval anecdote, though belonging to the farcical tradition underlying the Facetiae rather than to the moralistic one exemplified by the Gesta Romanorum. It breaks with both these traditions, however, in having a first person narrator presenting his personal perspective on the events:

There was a great lord, rich and powerful in property, who invited guests to a mansion; and I was among the invited. We were bustling and drank a lot. After dinner the musicians started to play on harps and drums and flutes, and the women, ladies and girls lined up to dance. I was so full that I laid down to sleep in a bedstead in the kitchen, and I closed the curtains so that no one would notice me there and force me to drink more. After I had rested for a while, I woke up and noticed that great lord with one of his wife’s servant girls in his arms; and he wanted to kiss her and attempt to discover whether she was a man or a woman. Among other words she said: ‘O sir, when will you give me that man’ – and she named him (and I know them all very well, and they are still alive) – ‘you have promised him to me so often, but nothing ever comes of it, even though I have duly fulfilled my promise to you. Tomorrow he will come to me in the orchard outside the walls, where I have arranged to meet him.'

\textsuperscript{660} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 71v-72r, from ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. g3r.

\textsuperscript{661} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 72r: ‘graef floris daermen also voel doech[ ... ]nt bescreuen’.

\textsuperscript{662} Ibid.: ‘want en heer is sculdich sijn dijenres [...] te staen in hoer rechten ende nijet te raden noch te helpen [...] hoer oneer ende scande’.

\textsuperscript{663} Ibid.: ‘Mer je gheleoff dat hem die vrouwe daer toe ghebracht heeft want salomen bescrijft datter gheen man also wijs en is hij en wart wel doer die vrouwen bedroghen ende verleijt jndijen sjij hoer loesheit natuurliecht ende boesheit te werck willen stellen’. The allusion is apparently to Proverbs, 6:23-26; Solomon is a central character in anti-feminist literature in the Middle Ages, as attested by Geoffrey Chaucer in The Merchant’s Tale, in L. D. Benson (general ed.), The Riverside Chaucer (Boston, MA, etc., 1987), p. 166 (IV (E) ll. 2277-81): ‘I woot wel that this Jew, this Salomon, / Foond of us wommen fooles many oon. / But though that he ne foond no good womman, / Yet hath ther founde many another man / Wommen ful trewe, ful goode, and vertuous.’

\textsuperscript{664} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 72r: ‘Ic sal v vertellen wat mijn daer eens van gheboert is’.
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Please come there and force him to become mine.’ ‘I shall do it’, he said. Then his wife entered the kitchen.665

The pre-arranged meeting between the two lovers takes place in a *locus amoenus* which Jan describes in elaborate detail over almost half a page. Disrupting the pleasant scene – ‘see what this beautiful lady had brought him to!’666 – the lord aims his crossbow at the young man and threatens to kill him as a rapist if he does not immediately promise to marry the young woman. After desperate pleas, the young man is given half a day to make up his mind, which he uses to ask another woman (who would become Jan’s informant for this part of the story)667 for guidance – ‘women are so subtle in quickly finding sly and cunning advice’.668 Unfortunately, the woman’s words are partly lost due to fire damage to the manuscript; but she appears to have told the young man to appeal to the lord for advice: the young man’s parents had entrusted him to the lord’s wise counsel and education – as we shall see, a recurrent theme in Jan’s writing and quite possibly based on his personal experience – so it was up to the lord to determine whether the woman was a suitable match for him. The lord, rendered speechless by this answer, dismisses the young man and never again reminds him of his threat.

Jan then returns to Count Floris, who, by contrast, was determined to carry out his threat; so, a little while after Gerard van Velsen had married, he sent him on a fabricated mission and during his absence raped his wife.669 Jan’s own experience had provided him with an explanation of the admired count’s otherwise inexplicable and inexcusable behaviour: the events he himself had witnessed had taught him that the cunning of women knows no bounds. This anecdote did not serve as an *exemplum* illustrating a

---

665 Ibid., fol. 72v-r: ‘Daer was een groet heer rijc ende machtich van goeden op een plaets ende in en huijs te gast ghenoet daer je mede gehebeden was Wij waren seer vrolic ende droncken zeer Na den eten begonnen die speelluijden te spelen op herpen bommen ende floijten ende die vrouwen joffrouwen ende maechden stelden hem om te danssen Ic was also wel ghestelt dat ic ghinc leghen slapen op een koets die in die coecken stonden ende je stree die gardijnen op dat mijn daer nijemant ghewaer en soude warden noch meer doen drinken Na dat je een wijl gherust hadde wart ic wacker ende mettijen vernam je den groten heer dwelce een van sijn wijffs dijenstjofferen in den narm hadde ende hij woude hoer kussen ende ter auentueren besoecoken off man off wijff was Onder anderen woerden seijde sij Och heer wanneer sult ghij mijn dijen man doen hebben ende sij noemden (ende je kense al ghelijc er wel ende sij leuen noch) ghij hebt en mijn soo dicwijls beloeft mer daer en coemt nijet off nochtans dat je v mijn ghefroesen wil hebet hij sal marghen bij mijn comen in den boemgaert ende singhel daer heb je hem dach ghelijc coemt doech daer ende dwincten mijn an Ic salt doen seijde hij Mettijen quam sijn huijsvrou in die coecken’.

666 Ibid., fol. 72v: ‘sijet doch waer hem dese scoen joffrou toe ghebracht hadde’.

667 Ibid.: ‘die je wel kenne ende wt hoeren mont weet jet’.

668 Ibid.: ‘die vrouwen sijn alzo subtiel om haestelic een vont ende losen raet te vinden’.

669 The possibility that Floris (or his biographers) may have learned the trick from the story of the conception of Arthur has, to my knowledge, never been commented on.
universal moral which each reader could apply to his or her own life, as was typical of medieval narratives, but rather enabled Jan to explain a specific historical event – at least to his own satisfaction, if not to ours.

The second personal anecdote told by Jan occurs following three miracles of the crucifix, from Antoninus, but attributed to Vincent of Beauvais. This is precisely the type of material which made historical writing a fount of narratives and exempla which could be used in sermons. Jan, however, does not treat these stories as exemplary: rather than shedding light on his own experience, they conform to and confirm it. ‘Listen now to what once happened to me’, he begins:

I was walking along the dike and I was alone, without a stick or a weapon. There was a country house which had a very foul and aggressive dog, which attacked everyone. I was still a boy, and the dog assaulted me as he used to do to everyone, and he was a huge rough country hound. I defended myself with stones as long as I could, and also with lumps of earth; but the more I threw, the closer he came to me. I screamed and shouted, but no one came to help me. Finally, he reached for my leg and my clothes; and when I saw this, I did not know what to do except to make the sign of the Holy Cross in front of his maw. Straightaway, the dog put his tail between his legs and stole away; and in this way I rid myself of the aggressive dog. Now I want to return to the counts of Holland.

---


671 See above, n. 625. In fact, the miracle stories, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 85r-v, are from Antoninus Florentinus, Opus, III, fol. 54v (xix.ix.xii).

672 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 85v: ‘Hoert doch hijer wat mijn eens gheboert is’.

673 Ibid.: ‘Ic quam op een tijt lanchs den dijck enden ic was alleen ende sonder stoc off wapen Daer stont een lant huys daer alten quan hont was ende zeer fel die alle man an ranste Ic was noch een jonghen die hont scoet mijn an als hij en ijghelic ghewoen was te doen ende twas een groet groff lant rekel Ic weerde mijn met stenen also lang als jc mocht ende oequ met cluten mer hoe jc meer smacte hoe hij meer na mijn toe quam ic rijep ic creet mer nijemant en quam mijn te baten ten laesten greep hij na mijn been ende clederen als ic dat sach en wist je anders gheen raet dan ic sloech hem voer sijn muijli het teijken des heijlighen cruys Die hont sloech rechtruoert sijn start tusken sijn benen ende sloep ewech ende jn deser manieren wardet jc den fellen hont quijt ende ontslaghen Nu wil je weder keren tot die grauen van hollant’.
Fig. 17: Willem van Naaldwijk (c. 1455-1506), cousin of Jan van Naaldwijk: Historisch Archief Westland, Naaldwijk

Image kindly provided by the Historisch Archief Westland, Naaldwijk.
Fig. 18: Hendrik van Naaldwijk (c. 1430-96), uncle and guardian of Jan van Naaldwijk: Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam

Image from Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam (www.rijksmuseum.nl).
PERSONAL INFORMATION ABOUT JAN

On close inspection, Jan’s chronicle contains an unusual amount of personal information, which at times make the work read like an autobiographically inspired document. Some of this information is very modest, such as details added to his sources which give an indication of his familiarity with the landscape of his own region: ‘The place where this bishop was defeated is still marked with a beautiful stone cross, dedicated to his eternal memory; one passes it when travelling by water through the Marendijk towards Utrecht and passing to the right side of the Old Rhine.’ Other information is more telling about Jan’s own life, particularly his formative years. In his account of the right of taxation and jurisdiction in the diocese of Utrecht, which Bishop Guy van Avennes had claimed for the whole diocese and all its fiefdoms in 1304, Jan notes that, in his own day, the fiefdom of the Lord of Montfoort (in the west of the present province of Utrecht) is an exception, as is shown by the existence of gallows administered by him. Jan, however, also knows this as an insider, stating that: ‘I myself have helped collect the money.’ Unfortunately, the passage has been rendered partly illegible by fire damage, so that the date given by Jan (in the fifteenth century) can no longer be read.

His connection to the lords of Montfoort, who were former leaders of the Hoeken, is confirmed by another passage. The notice of the death in battle of his first renowned forebear, Willem van Naaldwijk, in 1345, inspired him to include a genealogy of his family. The information is limited to the line of descent from Willem van Naaldwijk to Jan himself; and he admits that his knowledge does not extend very far beyond this, summarizing the stories he has heard about the origins of his family with a single ‘etcetera’: ‘I have heard many opinions about the reasons why the Naaldwijks came to

674 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 102v, ‘Daer dese biscop verslaghen wart staet noch een scoen stenen cruijs tot sijnder ewigher memorien ende men vaerter verbij als men vaert doer den maren dijck na vtrecht ende men den ouwen rijn der slineker hant laat legghen’, added to Beke, Croniken, p. 165 (cap. 75).


676 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 107v: ‘Ic heb seluer het ghelt helpen halen’. The rights of taxation and jurisdiction were taken away from the Lord of Montfoort in 1473, which formed the basis of his conflict with the diocese: Linden, Burggraven, pp. 149-52; the first mention of Willeme van Naaldwijk as wife of Jan van Montfoort is from 1475: ibid., p. 157; Montfoort’s possessions were lost in 1490, but recovered in 1499: ibid., pp. 174-5.


678 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 149v, from Beke, Croniken, p. 191 (cap. 81).
carry a crown for their livery, and also about their origins I have heard many arguments and words. Etcetera. From the genealogy we learn that Jan’s cousin Willeme van Naaldwijk (Fig. 17), daughter of his uncle and guardian Hendrik (Fig. 18), married Jan van Montfoort – this had happened by 1475. The marriage brought an end to the Naaldwijk’s control over their family estates. These events of the mid-1470s may have coincided with Jan’s formative years; indeed, he may well be the ‘Johannes de Naelwijck’ who matriculated at the University of Leuven in 1476. Intriguingly, twice in his chronicle, Jan refers to the practice of noblemen entrusting their children to local lords for education and experience. It seems that these passages, too, are a clue to his own circumstances and that through his cousin Willeme’s connection to Jan van Montfoort, Jan was also taken under the wing of the Montfoort family, where he gained administrative experience and engaged in tax collecting. Perhaps this was where he learned to write in the administrative script in which he wrote his chronicles and which, for c. 1514, appears rather old-fashioned, and it is perhaps also here that he became acquainted with the privilege granted by Margaret to her subjects in Holland.

In the passage containing the genealogy of the Naaldwijk family, we also get a hint of Jan’s awareness that he was not the most fortunate of the progeny of the Naaldwijk family. He announces that he was greatly indebted to his first cousin once removed Barbara van Gaasbeek: she ‘did me so many services that I could never thank her enough, and I am obliged always to pray for her and to serve her in whatever capacity she may require from me’. Jan had good reason to ingratiate himself with Barbara, since she had

679 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol 150r: ‘Ende hoe die van naeldwick comen te vueren ende tot een leueren te gheuen die croen daer heb ic veel opinijen off ghehoert Ende mede van hoer afcoemste heb ic veel verscheijen redenen ende woerden van ghehoert etcetera’.

680 Ibid., fols 149v-150r. See R. Fruin, Inventaris van het archief der heeren van Montfoort, berustende in het rijks-archief in Utrecht (The Hague, 1894), p. 48 (no. 21); Linden, Burggraven, p. 157.


682 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 72r: ‘doerom bestellen ende doen die […]n hoer kinderen ende maghen bij den heren op dat sij daer […]en leren ende wel bewaert sijn’; ibid., fols 72v-73r: ‘dat v vader ende v moeder v bij hem ghestelt hebben om dat hij v leren ende wisen […] doen en sout buten hem’.

683 This hand was more common at the turn of the century: cf. P. J. Horsman, J. Poelstra and J. P. Sigmond, Schriftspiegel: Nederlandse paleografische teksten van de 13de tot de 18de eeuw (Zutphen, 1984), pp. 9, 15-18; note that separation of stems and strokes in e, r and a became standard from c. 1500 – plates 33 (1503) and 35 (1504) do not have such a separation, whereas plates 36 (1511), 37 (1520) and 38 (1525) do, while plate 34 (1508) has both separated and connected a; E. I. Strubbe, Grondbegrippen van de paleografie der middeleeuwen, 2 vols (Ghent, 1961), II, plates 21 (1512) and 22 (1513) display this separation.

684 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 150r: ‘heeft mij also voel doechs ghedaen […]e hoer nijmmermeer voldancken en mach waerom je […]dich bin altijt voer hoer te bidden ende hoer te dijenen […] sij mijn van doen mach hebben’.
made a very advantageous marriage to Maximiliaan van Horne, a Burgundian courtier, knight of the Golden Fleece from 1516 and the recipient, in 1521, of a letter from Erasmus, who offered to help with the education of his and Barbara’s son. Had the proposal come to fruition, it would finally have provided Jan with the connection he had for so long sought to establish with the great Dutch humanist.

**Jan’s Earlier Works**

In a passage, quoted above, which Jan added to a story borrowed from the *Gesta Romanorum*, he mentions that he had translated a *History of King Arthur* from French into Dutch. In fact, he refers to three works, all attesting to his passion for history, which he produced before his chronicle of Holland: in addition to translating the *History of King Arthur*, he wrote a chronicle of Utrecht and another of England. Since these three works are lost, their precise content must remain a matter for speculation; nevertheless, Jan’s references to the works allow us to say something about them. The Arthurian history was a translation of a single French source, while the Utrecht chronicle was based mainly on the Utrecht chronicle in Veldener’s *Fasciculus temporum*. Jan’s chronicle of England, on the other hand, may have been a compilation similar to his chronicle of Holland. Froissart appears to have been the principal source, but certainly not the only one, as it included the Trojan foundation myth of Britain, which does not figure in Froissart’s *Chroniques*, since they cover only the period from 1322 to 1400. A central subject may have been the career of Edward, the Black Prince, whose mother Philippa linked the English monarchy to the dynasty of the counts of Holland.

---


686 See above, p. 140.

687 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 49r: ‘die histori van coninc artus die jc jan van naeldwijck ghetranslateert hebbe wt den walschen in duijths’.

688 Ibid., fol. 25r: ‘Het gheen dat jc in die cronijck van vthert niet […] hebbe dat sal je stellen in dese teghenwoerdighe cronijck […] stori want je die cronijck van vtrecht zeer cort ghemaect […] ende meest ghenomen wt een boeck gheheten Ffasciculus temporum’. References at fols 25r, 33v, 36r, 40v, 44r, 56v, 179v, 192r, 249v; this final reference occurs in the 1420s, but it seems likely the work covered at least the full period of Veldener’s text, that is, to 1456 (Veldener, *Fasciculus temporum*, fol. 274v).

689 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 20v, 132v, 148v, 153v.

690 Ibid., fol. 132v. See above, p. 98.
Jan’s interest in English affairs was also, no doubt, the reason why he translated the French *History of King Arthur*.\(^{691}\) That he chose to do so is all the more striking given the lack of early printed editions of Arthurian material in the Low Countries. It has been claimed that Arthur was ‘too far removed from the roots’ of the people of the Dutch Low Countries in the late Middle Ages to be considered particularly relevant.\(^{692}\) Jan’s translation suggests that the influence of Arthurian literature on the late medieval culture of the Dutch Low Countries was more profound than the absence of Arthurian publications might suggest.\(^{693}\)

\(^{691}\) Such information as Jan provides about this translation is not sufficient to allow us to identify his source. All we know is that it was a French text which linked Merlin to a forest in Northumberland; however, this had been a commonplace since Robert de Boron and had found its way into Dutch in the *Book of Merlin* of Jacob van Maerlant as early as the 1260s: Jacob van Maerlant, *Merlijn*, ed. J. van Vloten, on the CD-ROM Middelnederlands (The Hague and Antwerp, 1998), ll. 5846-980.


\(^{693}\) Further evidence is offered by the attempt in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sigs a2v-a3v, to create a link between the mythical history of Britain and that of Holland. Another intriguing piece of evidence is the recycled woodcut depicting the ‘Brittenburg’ and ‘Slavenburg’ in the *Divisiekroniek*, fols 17r and 29r, which has not previously been identified as a picture of Merlin at Vortigern’s castle; cf. W. M. Conway, *The Woodcutters of the Netherlands in the Fifteenth Century*, 3 vols (Cambridge, 1884), sect. 25, 8, no. 1; M. J. Schretlen, *Dutch and Flemish Woodcuts* (London, 1925), plate 75; H. van de Waal, *Drie eeuwen vaderlandsche geschied-uitbeelding, 1500-1800. Een iconologische studie*, 2 vols (The Hague, 1952), I, p. 137 and n. 2.
At the end of this chapter, we return to the image with which Jan van Naaldwijk opened his chronicle (Fig. 9). The three scenes below the author portrait, starting clockwise from the top left, illustrate a version of one of the many legends usually connected to King Midas, in which a monarch, ashamed of his abnormally sized ears, hides them under his hair and, to keep his secret safe, personally kills each of his barbers. In most versions, the king spares the life of one particular barber on the condition that he does not reveal the secret; but the barber betrays the king by telling it to, for example, a field of reeds, which then start repeating: ‘the king has donkey’s ears, the king has donkey’s ears’. But Jan gives the story a different ending: the central scene in Jan’s illustration, which depicts the conclusion of the narrative, is not found in any other recorded version of the story I have been able to track down.

Beke had mentioned the early Frisian king Aurindilius in his Chronographia; and the first part of his name was associated, in subsequent works, with the Latin word auris (ear), which seems to have provided the inspiration for a modest accretion of narrative detail about this king. The anonymous clerk may have been the first to mention that Aurindilius ‘was called Donkey’s Ears in Dutch’. The author of the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ added the information that the king was given this name on account of his long ears. This inference, which followed logically from the name ‘Donkey’s Ears’, was presumably all the more compelling because the story of a king with donkey’s ears had been known since antiquity and had remained popular throughout the Middle Ages, branching out into many different versions in local traditions throughout Europe.

---

695 Beke, Chronographia, p. 53 (cap. 27b); Beke, Croniken, p. 42 (cap. 27).
696 Clerc, Kronijk, p. 20: ‘diemen in duutsche plach te heten ezeloer’.
697 ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. a8r.
698 A. Aarne and S. Thompson, The Types of the Folktale: A Classification and Bibliography (Helsinki, 1961), LXXV, no. 184, type AT 782; H. Birkhan et al., Motif-Index of German Secular Narratives from the Beginning to 1400, 6 vols (Berlin, 2005-6), F 511.2.2 (‘Person with ass’s [horse’s] ears’), P446 (‘Barbers’),
Characteristically, chroniclers of Holland before Jan had never exploited this possibility. He, however, took the Dutch version of the king’s name as his starting-point, remarking that he had heard a story about him. Although he began with the standard first two stages of the story, which are depicted in the two back rooms in the illustration, he diverged from tradition and provided an altogether different conclusion:

Of this Sir Lem was born the great King Richard, who was called King Donkey’s Ears, because he had such long and large ears. ... At other times I have heard people say that this King Donkey’s Ears was very cruel, because he had every barber who shaved his beard killed, so that they would not reveal his long hanging ears. Eventually, his daughter heard about this, and she pitied those who had lost their lives in this way. Therefore, on a certain day she stripped naked, except for her breasts, which she covered, and thus, unabashed, she appeared before her father the king. [When he] saw [her appearing before him like that], he was [taken aback, and asked] her what all the fuss was about. She said [..............] what I was born with [..............] what came to me and grew on me, the shame [........... ‘What] do you mean by doing this?’, asked the king. ‘But sir,’ [she said, ‘I hoped that in] this way you would gain understanding and would no [longer bring ruin] to those who shave you and tend to you because of embarrassment [for what] you were born with; and don’t be angry [that I] have told you this, because natural pity and mercy made me do it.’ Then she left, and henceforth the king was no longer ashamed of his long ears. This King Donkey’s Ears was king of the Slavs, who are now Hollanders.

Stripped of its traditional supernatural conclusion, in which an object without speech reveals the secret, the humanity of the story’s protagonists is emphasized in Jan’s version,

N465 (‘Secret physical peculiarity uncovered by barber’). A survey of the different versions is provided by W. Crooke, ‘King Midas and his Ass’s Ears’, Folklore 22 (1911), pp. 183-202; the Dutch version is given there, p. 188. More recently, A. Thiel, Midas: Mythos und Verwandlung (Heidelberg, 2000), has studied the later reception of the classical accounts of the Midas story. For a more extensive study of the Celtic and French traditions, see Milin, Le roi Marc.

699 Birkhan, Motif-Index, has no similar narrative under the relevant motifs (see previous note), nor under ‘Shame’, ‘Nakedness’, ‘Nudity’, ‘King’, ‘Daughter’ or the name ‘Mida’.

700 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 22v-23r: ‘Ende van dese heer lem wart gheboren die machtighe coninc Ritsaert die sij noemden coninc ezeloer om dat hij soe langhe ende grote oren hadde ende was een zeer groet man ende hadt ock een roesinne tot een wijff daer hij voel kinderen bij creech ende bij sonder een dochter die daer na een coninghinne van vrieslanst wart Je heb horen seghgen tot anderen tiden dat dese coninc ezeloer zeer wreet was want hij dede alle die barbiers doden die sijn baert scoren op dat sijn nijett wt breghen en souden van sijn langhe hanghende oren Dit heeft ten laetsten sijn dochter vernomen ende het heeft hoer zeer ontfarmd dat dije also hoer lijff verloren Waer om sij hoer op een tijt heel naect heeft gheemaect sonder alleen hoer bursten die heeft sij ghecomt ende alsoe onsamemlikken is sij voer den coninc horen vader ghecomen [........] ghwawert warts was hij s[........] hoer wat dit beduijde Sij seijde [........] het gheen daer Ic mede gheboren be[........] mijn na ghecomen ende an ghwassen die scaem [........] meijnt ghij hijer meide seijde die coninc Mer heer [........] hijer doer tot beken komen sout ende en stornt nijet [........] der gheenre die v sceren ende haunen ouermits scaemte [........] daer ghij mede gheboren sijt ende en sijter nijet gram [........] v dit ghesijt heb want die natuer melijenheit ende barn [........]t breghen mijn daer toe Ende mettijen is sij weder met [........] van daen ghestreken Ende die coninc en heeft hem van dijer [........] nijet meer ghescaemt sijn langhe oren Deze coninc ezeloer was [........]nine van den slauen dat nu hollanders sijn’
and its moral message is presented as an intrinsic, though implicit, part of the historical narrative. In his hands, it becomes an exemplary story grounded in history.\textsuperscript{701}

The question remains as to why Jan chose this story for the opening illustration of his chronicle, especially since it meant that many pages of text separated the image from the narrative account, as King Donkey’s Ears is only introduced after the \textit{descriptio} and a lengthy account of the earliest history of Holland (as well as the career of Julius Caesar). Moreover, the episode is not particularly central to the early history of Holland, even in Jan’s version.

Several reasons may have inspired him, not least perhaps the opportunity to enliven the chronicle with an image of a naked young woman.\textsuperscript{702} A further motivation may have to do with the changed political landscape. On several occasions throughout the fifteenth century, the dukes of Burgundy had aspired to a royal title; and ‘King of Friesland’, which is how King Donkey’s Ears is referred to in Jan’s sources, had at times been proposed as a title with historical precedent (though the precedent was dubious).\textsuperscript{703} This may be the context in which we should interpret Jan’s alterations to his sources: as we have seen, in his geographical description, Utrecht is subordinated to Holland and Friesland;\textsuperscript{704} and, in the stories he tells about the origins of Holland, as well as on his frontispiece, an illustrious Frisian king – although now explicitly called a Hollander – is given prominence.

\textsuperscript{701} The behaviour of the king’s daughter in Jan’s version is unusual, given that public nudity was considered offensive and shameful throughout the late Middle Ages; H. P. Duerr, \textit{Nacktheit und Scham. Der Mythos vom Zivilisationsprozeß}, I (Frankfurt am Main, 1988), pp. 283-91. A very rare medieval example of a similarly unabashed naked young woman in medieval narrative is in Hartmann von Aue, \textit{Der Arme Heinrich}, c. 1170 (ed. H. Mettke [Leipzig, 1974]), vv. 1193-6 (the girl in question defies expectations, as she was expected to be very ashamed, cf. vv. 1084-8). According to D. Buschinger, ‘Le “nu” dans quelques textes médiévaux allemands’, in \textit{Le nu et le vêtu au Moyen Âge (XIIe-XXIIe siècles)} (Aix-en-Provence, 2001), pp. 75-86, at 83, her lack of shame was due to her blissful state, ‘l’état paradisiaque’.


\textsuperscript{704} See above, p. 116.
In Beke’s chronicle, the history of Holland had only started with the foundation of the county in the time of the Carolingians. In Jan’s chronicle, however, the pre-Carolingian period acquired extensive detail and became a proper part of the county’s history. To Beke’s comment that the moment the county was granted to the counts was the beginning of Holland, Jan added the remark: ‘that before this, the people had been governed by other people, such as Antonius, King Donkey’s Ears, etcetera, as described before’. In this way, Holland’s history reached back to a period long before its separation from Utrecht. With regional unity achieved once again under the Habsburg Empire, but the diocese still remaining a regional power, the significance of the early history of Holland was no longer, as it had been for Beke, to show the desirability of unity between Utrecht and Holland, but rather to provide an illustrious historical precedent for the dominance of the secular rulers of the region over the diocese of Utrecht.

Jan’s decision to combine the illustration of King Donkey’s Ears with a portrayal of himself as compiler suggests that he saw the story as emblematic of his own work. He began his chronicle with an illustration of an episode which he himself had added to the historiographical tradition and which helped to embellish the accepted story of the origins of Holland. In the author portrait, he depicted himself copying from a source, with other volumes lying around; from the outset, he expanded the time-honoured history of Holland, not only with material from the books in his study, but also from his own experience and from stories he had heard people tell. As we have seen throughout this chapter, the principal effect of his compilatory activity was to expand the canon of Holland’s history, while leaving intact the framework established by the tradition ultimately founded on Beke’s *Chronographia*, an endeavour which made him a true heir to that same tradition.

---

705 To Beke, *Croniken*, p. 9 (cap. 6), ‘Kaerl die men den calen hiet, ende na een Roemsch keyser was, gaf der graefscap van Hollant die ierste heerlicheit’, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 24r adds: ‘al wast dat sij van anderluijden te voren beheert waren gheweest als van anthonius van coninc ezeloer etcetera ghelijc voerscreuen staet’.
Chapter 3

‘Dit boeck hoert toe Jan van Naaldwijck’

‘This book belongs to Jan van Naaldwijk’
– Jan van Naaldwijk’s Second Chronicle of Holland

Fig. 19: London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 8r:
Jan van Naaldwijk, second chronicle of Holland, descriptio

©The British Library Board. All rights reserved.
Reproduced with financial support of the University of London Central Research Fund.
Fig. 20: *Divisiekroniek*, title page

Image from The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek (www.kb.nl).
Fig. 21a: *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 418r

Reproduction from Het Utrechts Archief (www.hetutrechtsarchief.nl).

Fig. 21b: Hartmann Schedel, *Weltchronik*, fol. 142v

Fig. 22a. *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 313v (190x280mm)


Fig. 22b: Hartmann Schedel, *Weltchronik*, fol. 204r (305x450mm)

THE *DIVISIEKRONIEK*

In August 1517, two and a half years, at most, after Jan van Naaldwijk completed his first chronicle of Holland, another Dutch chronicle of Holland, written by an anonymous author, was published in Leiden by the printer Jan Seversz (Fig. 20). The title-page provided a brief, and not entirely accurate, description of the book’s contents:

The Chronicle of Holland, Zealand and Friesland, starting from Adam’s time to the birth of Our Lord Jesus, continuing to the year 1517. With the true origin: how Holland was first occupied and inhabited by the Trojans. And also containing the dukes of Bavaria, Hainault and Burgundy; the period they held the county; with the chronicle of the bishops of Utrecht, flawlessly covered and extensively reported.

In fact, the work did not include a claim that the population of Holland had a Trojan origin; and while it was, indeed, a chronicle of Holland and Utrecht, it had a universal historical dimension ignored in the description. In appearance (Figures 21a and 22a), the book was most akin to an illustrated universal chronicle: the printer was primarily inspired by the layout of Hartmann Schedel’s *Liber cronicarum* or *Weltchronik* (Figures 21b and 22b), from which he also copied several illustrations; as a result, it looks like a smaller and less sophisticated version of the *Weltchronik*, although with an added armorial interest. Schedel’s work also provided the author with one of his key organizational principles – short descriptions of the lives of popes and emperors which

---

706 *Divisiekroniek: Die cronycke van Hollant, Zeelant ende Vrieslant, beginnende van Adams tiden ...* (Leiden, 1517).

707 *Divisiekroniek*, title-page, fol. a.r: ‘Die cronycke van Hollantd Zeelantd ende Vrieslant beginnende van Adams tiden tot die geboerte ons heren Jhesu Voertgaende tot den iare M. CCCCC. Ende xvij. Met den rechten oersprone hoe Hollantd eerst begrepen ende bewoent is gheweest van den Troyanen. Ende is inhoudende van die hertogen van Beyeren Henegouwen ende Bourgongen Die tjit dat si ant graefscap geweest hebben. Met die cronike der biscoppen van wtrecht seer suuerlic geextendeert ende int lange verhaelt.’

708 The claim by K. Tilmans, “‘Autentijck ende warachtig’. Stedenstichtingen in de Hollandse geschiedschrijving: van Beke tot Aurelius’, *Holland* 21 (1989), pp. 68-87, at 82, that the chronicle contains a Trojan origin myth for the Hollanders is at odds with the book’s contents; see W. Keesman, ‘De Hollandse oudheid in het “Gouds kroniekeje”: over drukpers en geschiedschrijving’, *Spiegel der letteren* 49 (2007), pp. 165-82, at 177. The *Divisiekroniek* does provide a Trojan genealogy for the first count: fols 97v-98r (div. 4, cap. 11).

709 I agree with the suggestion made by Keesman, ‘Hollandse oudheid’, pp. 177-8, that the discrepancy between title-page and the book’s contents may have been the result of the differing interests of the author and the printer. See further below, nn. 721, 749.


711 The armorial interest of the *Divisiekronek* has not been investigated sufficiently. See Gerritsen, ‘Jan Seversz’, pp. 114-15.
frame the historical narrative – as well as some of his historical information.\textsuperscript{712} The chronicle is divided into thirty-two books, called \textit{divisies} (‘divisions’), each consisting of an irregular number of chapters. It is this organization into divisions, which the author adopted from Johannes a Leydis,\textsuperscript{713} that led later readers to refer to it as the \textit{Divisiekroniek} (‘The Division Chronicle’), the title by which it is nowadays known.\textsuperscript{714}

The \textit{Divisiekroniek}’s first two divisions partly deal with universal history, mainly concerning the Roman Empire and the Catholic Church, and partly with the pre-history of Holland and, at the conclusion of the second division, the foundation of the diocese of Utrecht.\textsuperscript{715} Most divisions are introduced by a chapter containing short biographical descriptions of popes and emperors together with some brief notes on universal history, often to do with portents (such as floods and famines, comets and eclipses, and monstrous creatures).\textsuperscript{716} The subsequent chapters are mostly about the counts of Holland, after which come chapters on the bishops of Utrecht and, occasionally, other principalities in the region. Broadly speaking, therefore, the organization of material concerning the Low Countries follows the pattern set out by Jan Beke and adopted and developed further by successive authors in the previous centuries, but inserted within the framework of universal, or at least Roman imperial, history. The structuring principle of the chronicle does not, however, derive from this broader framework; instead, it is entirely based, following established tradition, on the line of succession of the counts of Holland, each of whom is accorded a division. Consequently, the opening chapters of some divisions mention only one pope and one emperor,\textsuperscript{717} while others include several, depending on how many reigned during the lifetime of the various counts, who are always the central characters in each division.\textsuperscript{718} Thus, universal history was cast into the mould of the traditional historiography of the county.\textsuperscript{719}

\textsuperscript{712} Tilmans, \textit{Historiography}, p. 164; unlike Jan van Naaldwijk, the author appears to have used a German language edition.
\textsuperscript{713} Ibid., p. 142.
\textsuperscript{714} See ibid, pp. 308-10, for the history of the title, which was first used in the sixteenth century, but only gained general acceptance in the eighteenth.
\textsuperscript{715} \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fol. 51r (div. 2, cap. 34).
\textsuperscript{716} E.g., ibid., fols 88r (div. 4, cap. 1), 101v (div. 5, cap. 1).
\textsuperscript{717} E.g., ibid., fol. 184v (div. 20, cap. 1) has one pope (Boniface VIII) and one emperor (Albert I).
\textsuperscript{718} E.g., ibid., fols 112r-113v (div. 7, cap. 1) has seven popes (Sylvester II, John XVIII, John XIX, Sergius IV, Benedict VIII, John XX, Benedict IX) and two emperors (Henry II and Conrad II).
A further separation into three parts was superimposed on the divisions which structure the chronicle. This tripartite organization may have been inspired by other works, but the possibility that it was at least partly due to the printer should not be overlooked, since the decision was made at a very late stage in the production of the chronicle. Moreover, the author supplies no explanation for this division into three parts, which suggests that even if it was meant to represent an historical periodization, its significance had not crystallized into anything resembling the clear-cut distinction into ancient, medieval and modern which became universally accepted later on.

The tripartite structure did, however, correspond to another model of historiography, which would be recognizable to connoisseurs of the history of Holland and which the author of the Divisiekroniek would have encountered in the works of Jan Beke and Johannes a Leydis: Part I of the Divisiekroniek, from the start of the chronicle to the first chapters of the fourth division, covers the period from creation to the Carolingian era, concluding with a geographical description of Holland; Part II, which carries on until the first two chapters of the twenty-ninth division, tells the story of the foundation of the county of Holland up to the life of Philip the Good; and Part III goes from the point at

---

720 Tilmans, Historiography, pp. 142-5, claims the inspiration came from Flavio Biondo’s Decades (Historiarum ab inclinatione Romanorum imperii decades [Venice, 1483]). Yet, while mentioned as the source for a description of Rome (Divisiekroniek, fol. 18v), Biondo’s work is not referred to as a model; and while the Decades and the Divisiekroniek each comprise thirty-two parts, it is unclear how that work’s four ‘decades’ – ideally 10 books each – inspired the Divisiekroniek’s three superimposed parts of irregular length. See also above, Chapter 2, p. 111, and see below, n. 723. See for the organization of the Decades further D. Hay, ‘Flavio Biondo and the Middle Ages’, Proceedings of the British Academy 45 (1959), pp. 97-128, at 128.

721 Divisiekroniek, div. 29, cap. 16 is transposed to the end of div. 29, cap. 1, fol. 280r-v, immediately preceding the transition to Part III. See also Tilmans, Historiography, p. 145, who argues the decision was not made before 1516, when most of the chronicle had already been written. She does not observe that each part starts at the first page of a new quire (i.e., Divisiekroniek, fols 93r; 281r), suggesting it was the printer’s, rather than the author’s, decision. It is even possible that the first part of the chronicle had already been printed, since there is no reference to a tripartite division before the start of the second part (Divisiekroniek, fol. 93r). In any case, the tripartite division did not belong to an overarching and innovative historical argument which was inherent to the author’s historical vision. Further evidence of the printer’s influence on the production of the Divisiekroniek is found at the conclusion of a translated excerpt from Philippus de Leyden’s De reipublicae cura et sorte principantis (Divisiekroniek, div. 25, cap. 9), where extensive praise of that work is followed by an advertisement for Seversz’s edition (Leiden, 1516) (fol. 218v). See further above, n. 709, and below, n. 749.

722 Cf. Tilmans, Historiography, pp. 142-3. Such a division is unlikely to have been obvious to contemporaries, since even humanists had not yet adopted a consistent terminology for distinguishing the Middle Ages from other periods: U. Neddermeyer, Das Mittelalter in der deutschen Historiographie vom 15. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert. Geschichtsgliederung und Epochenverständnis in der frühen Neuzeit (Cologne, 1988), pp. 101-232; I. Bejczy, Erasmus and the Middle Ages: The Historical Consciousness of a Christian Humanist (Leiden, 2001), p. 34.
which Philip the Good becomes count of Holland to 1517. These periods reflect the three phases of Holland’s history, which, as we have seen in Chapter 1, had been part of the historiographical tradition since Beke. His first period was the time when a ‘greater Holland’ came into being; this was interrupted by a second period, when an independent, provincial county arose out of the turmoil caused by the dissolution of the Carolingian Empire; Beke’s third period looked forward to the restoration of a larger unity within the region. For the author of the Divisiekroniek, that unity had already started to be realized by the policies of Philip the Good. Far from attempting ‘to wrest the periodization of Holland’s history from the traditional rote of successive counts’, he clearly announces his adherence to that periodization in the concluding words of the introduction:

I have therefore organized and divided this book into thirty-three divisions or parts, and these divisions or parts further into chapters, so that the first division starts from the beginning of the world and goes to the time of Julius Caesar; the second division goes from Julius’s time until St Willibrord of England came to these lands; and the third division, until the first count of Holland, and thereafter from count to count, up to the present day [my emphasis].

The tripartite periodization thus confirmed rather than overturned the standard view of the history of Holland, giving expression, through its structure, to Beke’s vision of the three phases, real and ideal, which marked the county’s development. Yet at least for Jan van Naaldwijk, as for the later readers, it was the divisies, and not the three periods, which provided the work’s predominant structuring principle: its author, Jan writes, ‘composed his chronicle in divisions’.

---

723 Part I: Divisiekroniek, fols a.r-92v (div. 1 – div. 4, cap. 5); Part II: fols 93r-280v (div. 4, cap. 5 – div. 29, cap. 1 and transposed cap. 16); Part III: fols 281r-436r (div. 4, cap. 2 – div. 32, cap. 45; it may originally have ended at cap.36, fol. 429r).

724 See above, Chapter 1, pp. 34-34: the evidence presented there shows that the tripartite organization was by no means, as Tilmans, Historiography, p. 143, claims, ‘new to Dutch historiography’.

725 Ibid. Even if Tilmans is correct in arguing, p. 155, that the Divisiekroniek presents a cyclical view of history in its tripartite structure, the overall organization nevertheless presents a traditional linear Christian view, from creation to salvation.

726 Divisiekroniek, fol. b.v (prologue): ‘soe hebbe ick dit boeck gheordineert ende gedeelt in xxxiij. Diuisien ofte delen, ende die diuisien ofte delen voert in Capitelen Te weten dat die eerste diuisie beghint van den beghinne der werelt tot Julius Cesars tiden toe, Die anderde diuisie, van Julius tijden tot dat sinte Willeboort wt enghelant in desen landen quam Die derde diuisie totten eersten Graue van Hollant Ende so voort van Graue tot Graue tot open Dach van huyden’.

727 London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 51r: ‘die sijn cronijck ende boeck in diuisijen ghestelt heeft’. Tilmans provides no supporting evidence for her assertion, Historiography, p. 142, that although the “divisie” system overshadowed other organizational principles in the chronicle, “the structural context of the chronicle is actually the division into three parts ... for this transcends that of the “divisies”” (my emphasis). In contrast to the divisions, however, the tripartite organization is not mentioned.
The *Divisiekroniek* has become the most intensively studied late medieval chronicle of Holland. Because of its appeal to readers of the late sixteenth century and beyond, it has generated interest among early modern and modern historians, as well as medievalists. Even though a privilege issued by Emperor Charles V protected the work, guaranteeing the printer a monopoly on the printing of *dye Cronycke van Hollandt* (‘the Chronicle of Holland’),\(^728\) it has acquired the image, formed by later generations, of heralding a new era of historical writing in the Dutch Low Countries, a chronicle for the ‘Dutch nation’, providing it with an identity distinct from that of its Habsburg lords.\(^729\) Paradoxically, it has been seen, on the one hand, as the closing chapter of medieval historiography in the region,\(^730\) and, on the other, as the first humanist history of the Netherlands.\(^731\)

None of these characterizations is altogether accurate; and while Jan Romein was doubtless correct to say that its influence cannot be overstated,\(^732\) the work’s immediate impact – though not to be entirely discounted\(^733\) – has been exaggerated. The success of the *Divisiekroniek* was by no means instantaneous: its printer had tremendous difficulties finding a market for his ambitious endeavour; and even by 1530 a significant number of copies of the first print run (which has been estimated at no more than 150 copies) still remained unsold.\(^734\) Eight years later, a survey of Holland’s history, excerpted from the work, was printed and quickly became a bestseller, with five editions by the same printer within five years and at least 25 editions issued throughout the southern and northern

---

\(^728\) *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 436v.


\(^731\) Tilmans, *Historiography*, pp. 6-7, 81-4.


\(^734\) Tilmans, *Historiography*, p. 293; Gerritsen, ‘Jan Seversz’.
Netherlands by 1600. The reprinting of the complete Divisiekroniek was not, however, undertaken until 1585. By this time, the potential market for the chronicle, now updated with a continuation carrying the story on to the murder of William the Silent, had assumed a radically different shape in the recently formed republic. In this vastly altered political climate – and in an economic situation in which books were much more affordable than in the early sixteenth century – the chronicle attained the success it had failed to achieve when it was first published. It was reprinted twice more before the turn of the century, and a French translation was published in 1601.

As a typographical artefact, Johan Gerritsen writes, the Divisiekroniek ‘plainly shows ambition, but the lack of ability to realize this ambition in a respectable manner shows as plainly’. As a work of history, it appeared too late to capture the small market for vernacular chronicles of Holland in the late Middle Ages, which had already been satisfied in print by the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ and Veldener’s Dutch Fasciculus temporum, as well as by numerous manuscript chronicles. Yet it came too early to benefit from the demand for a ‘national’ history of the region, or even for the province of Holland specifically, which would be filled by later editions and adaptations at the end of the sixteenth century and throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Its focus on Holland, in addition, was too narrow to appeal to a supra-regional audience, while its inclusion of material on universal history was too limited and too derivative to enable it to compete with Schedel’s internationally popular world chronicle, which was available in Latin and German, or with the Fasciculus temporum and any number of historical works.

735 Dye cronijcke van Hollant Zeelant ende Vrieslant van alle geschiedenissen int corte, met dye cronijcke van den bisscoppen van Wrecht, hoe dat Hollant eerst begrepen is, gedurende totten jare vijftienhondert ende XXXVIII (Antwerp, 1538); see Tilmans, Historiography, p. 313; A. Hulshof, ‘Een middeleeuwsch kroniekje, dat tijdens de Republiek als schoolboek is gebruikt’, Het boek, 2e reeks, 1 (1912) pp. 329-36, 365-70; see below, Chapter 4, pp. 223-224.

736 Die cronycke van Hollant, Zeelant ende Vrieslant ... Noch is hier byghevoecht een cort verhael vande Regeringe ende ghedenkweerdichste gheschiedenisssen totten jare 1584 (Dordrecht and Delft, 1585); see Tilmans, Historiography, p. 310.

737 P. M. H. Cuijpers, Teksten als koopwaar: vroege drukkers verkennen de markt. Een kwantitatieve analyse van de productie van Nederlandstalige boeken (tot circa 1550) en de ‘lezershulp’ in de seculiere prozateksten (Nieuwkoop, 1998), pp. 45-54, shows that by 1480, medium sized printed books had become an affordable luxury for professional wage earners. Between 1480 and 1540, even though the average selling price of a typical vernacular Dutch text did not decrease much in real terms, books were printed in larger print runs.

738 Tilmans, Historiography, pp. 310-12; Grande chronique ancienne et moderne de Hollande, Zelande, West-Frise, Utrecht, Frise, Overijssel et Groeningen, jusques à la fin de l’an 1600 (Dordrecht, 1601).

in both Latin and vernacular languages, including Dutch. One aim of the remainder of this chapter will be to try to determine what the chronicle might have meant to readers who encountered it, not a half century or more later, in a radically changed political, economic and social landscape, but in or shortly after 1517. Our most extensive eyewitness report of such an encounter is Jan van Naaldwijk’s second chronicle of Holland.

Although Karin Tilmans has asserted that the author of the *Divisiekroniek* ‘evidently consulted Jan van Naaldwijk’s [first] chronicle of Holland’, the three passages on which she bases this claim were, in reality, taken independently by the two authors from the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’, which served as an important source for both works, as it covered the most recent period of Holland’s history. Yet Jan, for his part, evidently did consult the *Divisiekroniek*. It not only inspired him to return to the subject of the history of Holland but was also his main source for the supplement which he produced to his first chronicle of the county. Moreover, when Jan read the work, he recognized that it stemmed from the intellectual milieu with which he had hoped to establish connections at the time of writing his first chronicle.

---

740 Tilmans, *Historiography*, p. 294, estimates that the price of the *Divisiekroniek* cannot have been much lower than that of Hartmann Schedel’s chronicle. The latter would have easily won a competition on aesthetic grounds, as well as on size – the dimensions of its pages dwarfed those of the *Divisiekroniek*’s (e.g., 305x450mm compared to 190x280mm in the copies London, British Library, shelfmarks IC.7452 [Schedel] and 9405.f.13 [Divisiekroniek], cf. Figs 22a and 22b).

741 Tilmans, *Historiography*, p. 193 and n. 129; i.e., *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 363r (div. 30, cap. 91) and London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 287v, taken from *Die alder excellenste cronyke van Brabant, Hollant, Seelandt, Vlaenderen int generael*, 2nd edition (Antwerp, 1512), sigs cc5v-cce6r (the *Divisiekroniek* shares variants with the Brabant chronicle – e.g., ‘xvi M’ instead of Jan’s ‘xxiii’ – and does not have Jan’s additions, e.g., ‘Oeck was daer een bastert van sintpol’); *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 384 (div. 31, cap. 35) and MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 299v, from *Alder excellenste cronyke*, sigs dd4v-ee1r, *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 390r (div. 31, cap. 47) and MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 312, from *Alder excellenste cronyke*, sigs ee2v-ee3r.

742 For Jan, see above, Chapter 2, pp. 92-93; for *Divisiekroniek*: Tilmans, *Historiography*, pp. 176-7.

743 *The terminus post quem* of Jan’s second chronicle is the publication of the *Divisiekroniek* in August 1517; *the terminus ante quem* (assuming the chronicle was written more or less consecutively) is c. April 1524, when Philip of Burgundy, whom Jan mentions as bishop of Utrecht (1517-24), died; Jan, towards the end of his chronicle, copies the *Divisiekroniek*’s information that he is still alive, while adding that he has become bishop (MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 235r: ‘phillips die noch leeft ammireal van der zee ende nu bispoc van wthert’). On Philip, see P. G. Bietenholz, ‘Philip (I) of Burgundy, Bishop of Utrecht’, in P. G. Bietenholz and T. B. Deutscher (eds), *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and Reformation*, III (Toronto, Buffalo, London, 1987), pp. 230-31.
Fig. 23: London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 1r:
Jan van Naaldwijk, second chronicle of Holland, prologue

©The British Library Board. All rights reserved.
Reproduced with financial support of the University of London Central Research Fund.
THE PROLOGUE TO JAN’S SECOND CHRONICLE OF HOLLAND

For his second chronicle Jan wrote the kind of introduction which had been missing from his earlier work (Fig. 23): first, putting forward a number of philosophical justifications for writing history, buttressed by four authorities – three biblical and one patristic; then, giving his reasons for writing the chronicle (as with his first one, there still is no sign of a desire for patronage, or, for that matter, much sign of an intended audience); and, finally, setting out his method and, especially, his sources.

The Divisiekroniek was not the model for this prologue. In fact, I have not been able to identify any direct source among the books Jan is known to have read; and it may well be that he himself gathered together the commonplaces he uses to justify the writing of history. This passage is a reflection on the desirability and nature of wisdom, concluding with an argument about how to acquire it through reading history. Jan starts with a citation from Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) on the study of wisdom as the basis of good (self-) governance, followed by the account of the wisdom of Solomon from 1 Kings and statements from the Book of Wisdom about the sweetness of residing in wisdom, and he finishes with a comment from the introduction to the second book of Gregory the Great’s Moralia in Job, to the effect that Scripture, and by extension historiography, is ‘like a mirror in which we can reflect our appearance, to see our disfigurement and defects’ by examining the consequences of past actions. Therefore, histories help us to acquire wisdom:

by reading Holy Scripture, or histories and chronicles, we can learn to what end one person or another was brought on account of their evil or good deeds; such things and histories can entice us to love virtue and good deeds, to avoid evil and sin, and to fear and avoid shame, confusion and blame.

744 See above, Chapter 2, pp. 80-82.
745 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 1r-v. A transcription of the manuscript is presented in Documentary Appendix 2.
747 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 1r: ‘Die wijsheijt en heeft in hoer gall noch bitterheijt mer is vol alre ghenoechten ende soetichets ... alsmen bescreuen vint int boeck sapiencia int viij capittel’; Biblia sacra, ed. Weber et al., II, p. 1011 (Sap 8:1): ‘adtingit enim a fine usque ad finem fortiter et disponit omnia suaviter’.
748 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 1r-v: ‘Om welcke reden ende woerden te confirmeren seijt sunte gregorius int eerste capittel van sijn anderde boeck van sijn moralizatijen Dat die heijlighe scrift ende te lezen ende te studeren van dinghen ende soecken die gheschijten sijn js ghelijck een spieghel daer wij ons aensicht ende ghedaente in spieghelen moghen om te sijen ende te weten onse mismaectheijt ende veghen Mede moghen wij daer in kennen onse scoenheijt ende gauwe van gracijen ijndijen wij daer mede versijen sijn ende hebben
There is nothing particularly original in Jan’s comments, nor do they set out a specific historiographical programme in the way that the introduction of the *Divisiekroniek* does (there, for example, much time is spent on justifying the inclusion of universal historical material in a regional chronicle). The general ideas about wisdom and the writing and reading of history in Jan’s prologue would, in fact, be applicable to virtually any historical work. Nevertheless, it may be that the *Divisiekroniek*’s long introduction – which falls into two parts, the first of which is also a general reflection on the utility of writing history, and the second a more applied statement of methodology – made Jan aware that his own chronicle, too, should begin with a proper prologue.

Jan’s prologue likewise falls into two parts. After his theoretical justification of writing history, which concludes with an announcement of the subject of the chronicle (‘Therefore, in this current book, I shall describe all the virtuous facts, good deeds and the powers of the counts, princes and lords of Holland, Zeeland and Friesland’), a new paragraph begins, in which he describes the circumstances that led him to embark on this work:

I wrote a chronicle of Holland; but a chronicle has now been published, printed by Jan Seversz, the printer, who covered the costs for Brother Cornelius, regular at Lopsen, a poet and a brilliant man, who wrote it at his request. He translated much of its contents out of Latin into Dutch from Willem of Gouda’s chronicle, which I mentioned in the

die ons vercijeren ende s[…] Want jnt lezen van die heijlighe scrift off historijen […]nijcken moghen wij hoeren ende verstaen tot wat ejn ide ende dandere doer quaeft off weldoen ghecomen sijn weleke saken ende ghesciensisse ons moghen trekken ende breghen om doeckt ende weldaet te minnen, te vlijen tquaet ende sunde, te vrezen ende te scuwen ende ghescienisse ons moghen trecken ende breden om doecht ende weldaet te minnen, te vlijen tquaet ende sunde, te vrezen ende te scuwen ende ghescienisse ons moghen trecken ende breden.


749 *Divisiekroniek*, fol. a.v. The second part of the prologue, which is much more concerned with the work itself, has its own heading: ‘Wat die intencie ende meninghe des auctoers van desen teghenwoerighen cronijcke ende historye is’. Once again, the *Divisiekroniek* gives the impression of being written by two authors – or perhaps a printer, who was responsible for the first part of the introduction and who praises the chronicle as (fol. a.v) ‘een van den minsten nyet’, and an author, who wrote the second part and who modestly describes himself as (ibid.) ‘onder allen anderen historienscrivers die alre minste ende onbequaemste’. See above, nn. 709, 721.

750 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 1v: ‘Waerom jc in dit teghenwoerdighe boeck bescriuen sall alle die vrome feijten weldaden ende moghentheijt der grauen princhen ende heren van hollant zeelant ende vrieslant’.
introduction to my own chronicle of Holland. In addition, it contains many matters and beautiful histories taken from various books and authors, from Latin and Dutch.\textsuperscript{751}

The elusive Latin chronicle of Holland by Erasmus’s friend Willem Hermans of Gouda, which Jan had wanted to use as a source when he initially decided to write a chronicle of Holland, finally came to him through the work of Cornelius Aurelius (Cornelis Gerard of Gouda), another friend of Erasmus and younger cousin of Hermans.\textsuperscript{752} So now Jan could at last gain access to the historical learning of Erasmus’s circle – or at least so he appears to have believed.

The anonymously published \textit{Divisiekroniek}, in reality, presented him with only a tentative link to this circle of humanists, based on a reference to Cornelius Aurelius as the author of a Latin treatise, at the time unpublished, about the early history of Holland, a Dutch translation of which was included in the chronicle:

The following was taken from a little treatise written by Cor\[nelius\] Aure\[lius\], canon regular; but I leave it to the learned historiographers and teachers to judge whether it is entirely authentic and true. And because I observe that it contains many notable points written by Julius Caesar and Cornelius Tacitus, I therefore want to insert it here into this chronicle, so that it may be remembered.\textsuperscript{753}

As we have seen above, Jan refers to this author as ‘Cornelius, regular at Lopsen’. Aurelius did, indeed, spend a large part of his career in the monastery of Lopsen, or Hieronymusdal, near Leiden, and was prior there from 1502 to 1504.\textsuperscript{754} This association

\textsuperscript{751} Ibid.: ‘Ic heb een cronijck van hollant ghemaect, mer wantter nu een cronijck te voerschijn is ghecomen die ghedruct is van jan seersoen printer, ende ghemaect tot sijnre kosten ende begheerten van broederen cornelius van lopzen regulijer een poeta ende vernuft man Die welc daer voel in ghetranslateert heeft wt den latijnen in duijtsch wt die cronijck die wilhelmus van der gow ghemaect heeft daer jc mencij van ghemaect hebbe int begehinzel van die cronijck van hollant voerscreuen Mede sijn daer in ghetoghen veel materijen ende scone historijen wt verscheijen boecken ende autoeren wten latijnen ende wten duijtschen’.


\textsuperscript{753} \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fol. 11r (div. 1, cap. 9): ‘dat ghene dat hier nu volcht is getogen wt een tractaetgen dat broeder. Cor. Aure. canonick regulier ghemaect heeft, mer oft al autentijck ende warachtich is beueel ic den geleerden historiographen ende meesters ende also ic daer in beuinde vele notabele puncten die Julius cesar ende cornelius tacitus bescreuen hebben, aldus wil ic dat hier mede in dese cronike insereren ende setten op dattet in memorie bluien mach.’ It is noteworthy that the author of the \textit{Divisiekroniek} uses the same vocabulary to express scepticism about the veracity of origin stories related by other writers: ibid., fol. 4r (div. 1, cap. 4): ‘wat hier van dese nageboren noes soen sij beuwe ic den gheleerden want elcke nacie ende gheslachte begeert de outse haercoemst te hebben’ (my emphasis). See below, p. 191 and n. 833.

was not mentioned in the *Divisiekroniek*, nor was Aurelius’s connection to Willem Hermans, which Jan assumed was behind the chronicle’s innovations. So, at least part of Jan’s information about Aurelius must have come from other sources.

ERASMUS, WILLEM HERMANS AND CORNELIUS AURELIUS

It was only after the chronicles of Jan van Naaldwijk were rediscovered that scholars were able to attribute the *Divisiekroniek* to Cornelius Aurelius; Jan’s reference to his authorship was the sole source for this identification. That the *Divisiekroniek* was published anonymously is far from remarkable. Modern preoccupations with authorship were not shared by medieval readers, whose attitudes were no doubt carried into the early modern period, especially with regard to vernacular texts. The ‘Chronicle of Gouda’

---


756 R. Fruin, ‘De samensteller van de zoogenaamde Divisie-Kroniek’, *Handelingen en mededeelingen van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde* (1889), pp. 114-22. Only one independent source has since been identified (in E. W. Moes and C. P. Burger Jr, *De Amsterdamsche boekdrukkers en uitgevers in de zestiende eeuw*, 4 vols [Amsterdam, 1900-15], III, pp. 239-40): the fly-leafs of a copy of the *Divisiekroniek* (1595-7) at Tresoar, Leeuwarden (shelfmark 1670 G fol), contain a note in an early hand (c. 1600): ‘Hollandsche Kronyk beschreven door Cornelius Aurelius van der Goude, schoolmr. in zijn leven geweest van den grooten Erasmus’. The hand shares some characteristics with, but is not identical to, that of van Meteren. The comment by Alardus Amstelredamus, ‘Grandius Iliade nitidum, cultumque volumen, / Acta batavorum scribit et historias’ (Cornelius Crocus, *Epistola* [Cologne, 1531], sig. G1v; cf. Tilmans, *Historiography*, p. 77), does not provide corroborative evidence for Aurelius’s authorship of the *Divisiekroniek*, as it may well be a poetic reference to his treatises on the Batavian origins of Holland, or to the lost *De Hollandiae nostrae illustribus viris et locis* (Tilmans, *Historiography*, p. 263).

757 Anonymous authorship is all but ignored in books such as A. J. Minnis, *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. (Aldershot, 1988) and J. Wogan Brown, N. Watson, A. Taylor and R. Evans (eds), *The Idea of the Vernacular: An Anthology of Middle English Literary Theory* (University Park, PA, 1999), which have emphasized the self-consciousness of medieval authorship. Nevertheless, the fact that medieval texts were often transmitted anonymously does not detract from, but rather adds to, the importance of the issue of authorship in medieval textual practice. Over the course of transmission, texts sometimes lost attributions and acquired new ones, as happened, e.g., to the *Historia Brittonum*, which was variously ascribed to the all but unknown Nennius and the famous Gildas, as well as being transmitted anonymously (D. Dumville, ‘“Nennius” and the *Historia Brittonum*’, *Studia Celtica* 10/11 [1975/6], pp. 78-95). On occasion, works were attributed to authors as a form of advertisement or to indicate a literary context: see, e.g., F. W. Bonner, ‘The Genesis of the Chaucer Apocrypha’, *Studies in Philology* 48 (1951), pp. 461-81. That such medieval attitudes towards (anonymous) authorship were amplified rather than replaced in Renaissance England is admirably shown by M. L. North, *The Anonymus Renaissance: Cultures of Discretion in Tudor-Stuart England* (Chicago, 2003); esp. pp. 35-55; see also A. Gillespie, *Print Culture and the Medieval Author: Chaucer, Lydgate, and their Books*, 1473-1557 (Oxford, 2006), esp. pp. 5-16. A nineteenth-century forgery, purporting to be an extended report by Poggio of the trial and execution of Jerome of Prague, is a modern example; see R. G. Salomon, ‘Poggio
did not bear an author’s name, nor did the *Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant*, nor even Hartmann Schedel’s *Weltchronik* (in the latter case, however, the name of the author was widely known among contemporaries).\(^758\) In fact, as an author of a late medieval vernacular chronicle of Holland, Jan van Naaldwijk was rather unusual in referring to himself by name.\(^759\) So, instead of speculating as to why the author of the *Divisiekroniek* chose to remain anonymous,\(^760\) we should try to determine why Jan chose to ascribe it to Aurelius, and how he got hold of the information on which he based this attribution.\(^761\) After all, as he himself admitted in the prologue to his first chronicle of Holland, he was not very well connected to the world of scholarship, at least not sufficiently to have access to recent unpublished works – the Latin chronicle of Holland by Willem Hermans, he claimed, had been unavailable to him because it was not ‘published or printed’.\(^762\)

We should also take note of the nuances in Jan’s remarks about Erasmus in the same prologue:

---

758 Johannes Trithemius, *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (Basel, 1494), fol. 139v; *Divisiekroniek*, fol. b.v.

759 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 2r, 49r; the exceptions are Beke (whose name also appears in the Dutch translation of his chronicle) and the ‘Heraut Beyeren’ (Claes Heynenzoon); the list of chronicles issued anonymously includes those in Veldener’s *Fasciculus temporum*, the ‘Kattendijke chronicle’, the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ and many others.

760 Cf. Tilmans, *Historiography*, pp. 79-80: ‘Aurelius’s caution with regard to “his” *Divisiekroniek* is not hard to explain. His manuscript, submitted in 1516 – before the advent of Luther in 1517 and the tide of history overtook him – contained a scathing attack on the sale of indulgences. By the time these pages had been published and the printer Seversz had been unmasked as an unmitigated Lutheran (he was exiled from Holland in 1524) Aurelius the monk found it expedient to disclaim any connection with both the heretic and the chronicle.’ The chronology implied in this claim implausibly suggests that the impact of Luther’s ideas and reactions to it in the Dutch Low Countries were immediate or, indeed, occurred before the fact; elsewhere Tilmans calls the chronicle ‘quasi-luthérien avant la lettre’ (‘La grande Chronique’, p. 114). Seversz’s trial in 1524 was, in fact, the first of its kind in the northern Low Countries, and evidence for anxiety about Lutheran ideas there is scant before at least 1522: P. Fredericq et al. (eds), *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicæ: verzameling van stukken betreffende de pauselijke en bisschoppelijke inquisitie in de Nederlanden*, IV: *Tijdvak der hervorming in de zestiende eeuw* (1514–1525) (Ghent and The Hague, 1900), pp. xv-xxvii; M. E. Kronenberg, ‘Vervolging van kettersche boeken in de Nederlanden (c. 1518–1528)’, *Het boek*, 2e reeks, 16 (1927), pp. 163-204; M. E. Kronenberg, ‘Lotgevallen van Jan Seversz., boekdrukker te Leiden (c. 1502–1524) en te Antwerpen (c. 1527–1530)’, *Het boek*, 2e reeks, 13 (1924), pp. 1-38.

761 This is not to say that Cornelius Aurelius cannot have been the author of the *Divisiekroniek*; in my opinion, even if he is the strongest candidate, the evidence is inconclusive (see above, nn. 756, 760, and below, pp. 180-181), and the role played by the printer’s decisions regarding the content and form of the chronicle should not be underestimated (see above, nn. 709, 721, 749). More importantly, however, the question of who the author was should not be given undue emphasis, and arguments about the work should be based on its anonymity.

762 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r: ‘je ... hoepte te sijen wt een cronijck’; ‘Ick heb verstaen dat dese cronijck nijet te voerschijn en is ghecomen noch gheprent’; ‘noch nijet te voerschijn’; ‘dewele je verstont dat gh[e]... soude warden in latij’n’.

---


175
This Willem has produced many books – and had them printed – which he wrote in the honour of this Erasmus (when Erasmus lived in Paris, and I did, too, and I saw and read them there), as well as a couple of letters to him. And, among other things, he has recently described in eloquent prose how the people of Guelders captured Weesp and Muiden, in which he showed himself to be a very knowledgeable and good writer.\(^{763}\)

The implication, again, is that Jan had access only to the published works of the circle he associated with Erasmus. Apparently, he was not averse to a certain amount of exaggeration: the ‘many books’ which Hermans dedicated to Erasmus amounted to a single collection of poetry, the *Silva odarum*, which had been printed in Paris, at Erasmus’s instigation, and under his editorship, in 1497.\(^{764}\) There is nothing in Jan’s comments, moreover, to suggest that he had read anything more of Hermans’s works than what was available in print,\(^{765}\) nor that, as has been suggested, he saw books by Hermans in Erasmus’s library,\(^{766}\) and there is not a scrap of evidence that he was tutored by Erasmus and shared a house with him.\(^{767}\) Indeed, we cannot ascertain whether the two men were actually in Paris at the same time, as Jan implies; and if he had met Erasmus in person,\(^{768}\) he would surely have mentioned the fact. Nor do we know whether Jan ever studied at the University of Paris, though we can at least say that his name does not show up in the published matriculation registers.\(^{769}\) A comment in his second chronicle, about the privileges of students at the University of Paris, does suggest a certain familiarity with the institution;\(^{770}\) but, as a scion of Holland’s nobility, he would undoubtedly have numbered several of its alumni among his acquaintances.\(^{771}\)

\(^{763}\) Ibid.: ‘Dese wilhelmus heeft veel boecken ghemaect ende laten drucken die hij ghescreuen heeft ter eren herasum voerghenoemt (doen herasmus te parijs woende ende ic oecck daer jese ghesijen ende ghelesen hebbe) Ende oecck sommighe epistelen an hem Ende onder anderen heeft hij cortes ende olnanceks gheleden zeer oratoerlic in prosen bescreuen woe dat die gheldersche weesp ende mujden wonnen daer hij hem seluen zeer wetelic ende goet clerck in toent’.


\(^{765}\) See above, Chapter 2, p. 123, n. 560, for the evidence concerning the dating of Willem Hermans’s *Olandie Geltrieque bellum* (Amsterdam, n. d.).

\(^{766}\) For this suggestion, see Tilmans, *Historiography*, p. 90.


\(^{770}\) The comment comes at the end of his account of the Tignonville affair (see C. Gauvard, ‘Les humanistes et la justice sous le regne de Charles VI’, in M. Ornato and N. Pons [eds], *Pratiques de la culture écrite en France au XYe siècle* [Louvain-la-Neuve, 1995], pp. 217-44), from Robert Gaguin,
There is little doubt, however, that Jan himself had been to Paris. In addition to the statement cited above, there is a further indication in a brief but interesting comment in his second chronicle. The *Divisiekroniek* included a description of the capture of Philippa, daughter of Guy de Dampierre of Flanders, in Paris: ‘When this Philippa arrived in Paris, accompanied by thirty knights and twenty young noblewomen, she was promptly betrayed and the twenty ladies were strangled and thrown into the Seine, while the thirty knights were hung from gallows.’ Jan added to the mention of the Seine a brief aside – quite ridiculous in its immediate context – no doubt, based on personal reminiscence: ‘it is a beautiful river, running through Paris along many places’.

In the end, it seems that we should not read anything more into his remarks about Willem Hermans than that Jan had visited Paris in or after 1497, when the *Silva odarum* were published, and had come across a copy of this volume there, most probably at a bookshop.

Because in the prologues to his chronicles Jan provides otherwise unknown details about the activities of the humanists of Holland in the crucial period of the early sixteenth century, historians have been eager to take his comments at face value and to interpret them as insider knowledge. For example, his remarks about a Latin chronicle of Holland by Willem Hermans have become the starting-point for speculation about this work, even though there is no firm evidence for its existence. The only unambiguous clue, apart

---

*Compendium super Francorum gestis* (Paris, 1511), fol. 198r-v (lib. 9): MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 194v-195r, adds: ‘Die vnuersiteijt was in dezen tijden zeer gheacht gheeert ende van groter machten in die stede ende stat van parij alzoe dat waer sij hoer hant an stelden dijes quamen sij te bouen ende hadden ghehoer Ten was nijet ghelijct nu is want daer en is nu nijemant die hem stellen wil voer die vrijheden ende priuilegien der studenten om die te beschermen ende in sijn wezen ende rechten te houwen’.

Gabriel and Boyce, *Liber receptorum nationis Anglicanae (Alemanniae)*, col. 273, records a Johannes van Naaldwijk matriculating as a Bachelor in Arts in 1455.

*Divisiekroniek*, fol. 190r (div. 21, cap. 8): ‘als dese phillipe voorseit gecomen was tot parij verselt wezende met xxx. ridderen ende xx edele ioncfrouwen, so worde si terstont vergeuen ende die xx ioncfrouwen worden geworcht ende in die zeyne geworpen ende die xxx ridderen worden an galgen gehangen’.

MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 83r: ‘ende als dese phillipe voerscreuen ghecomen was tot parijs verselt wezende met xxx ridderen ende xx edele ioncfrouwen. wart sij terstont vergeuen ende die xx joffrouwen warden ghetweert ende in die zeyne geworpen ende is een scone ruijjer lopende tot voel plecken doer parijs, ende die xxx ridderen warden an ghalghen ghenghgen’ (my emphasis). Another superfluous reference to the Seine is found in Jan’s first chronicle: MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 135r: ‘een stat ghe[....] Daer een riuier doer loept gheheten die zeyne’ (my emphasis), added to Jan Beke, *Croniken van den stichte van Utrecht ende van Hollant*, ed. H. Bruch (The Hague, 1982), p. 188 (cap. 81).


from Jan’s comments, is a statement by Willem Hermans himself, in the introduction to his *Olandie Gelrieque bellum*: ‘I have decided, if the gods permit, to publish at some point a complete history of Holland.’ There is no reason to assume that Jan had any other source of information about Hermans’s chronicle of Holland, while the edition of the *Silva odarum* sufficed to provide him with the link to Erasmus. The only fact about Hermans which Jan could not find in any of his known sources was that he had already died; he says in the prologue to his first chronicle that this was the reason he had decided not to wait any longer for Hermans’s chronicle to become available. As Hermans had died in 1510, and Jan completed his first chronicle in 1514, he may have heard of his death not long after it had occurred, perhaps in the shop where he bought his books; on the other hand, it could have been nothing more than a guess on his part. His remark that ‘this Willem produced many books – and had them printed’, if also a guess, was a less happy one: apart from the two works consulted by Jan, only one other publication connected to Hermans had been issued by 1514.

The *Silva odarum* enabled Jan to connect Hermans not only to Erasmus, but also to Robert Gaguin: as Jan noted, the volume of Hermans’s poetry contained letters as well, although these were not, in fact, by Hermans himself but rather by Erasmus and Gaguin, in praise of Hermans’s poetry. The connections between the two men who had both

---

Geschiedschrijving in middeleeuws Egmond (Hilversum, 1990), pp. 169-91. Erasmus’s extravagant praise for Hermans’s activities as an historian (Erasmus, *Panegyricus*, ed. O. Herding, in his *Opera omnia*, IV.i [Amsterdam, 1974], p. 34) does not imply that he wrote a Latin chronicle of Holland (as argued by Tilmans, ‘Hollandse kroniek’, p. 169), but instead refers to historically oriented works such as the panegyric in *Silva odarum*, sigs d3v-d5r, and the *Olandie Gelrieque bellum*. Reinier Snoy, Hermans’s literary executor, was probably not exaggerating when, in a letter to Erasmus (possibly from 1516), he described the historical notes about Holland left behind by Hermans as ‘fragmenta quaedam, ita lacera atque imperfecta vt Edippo opus foret’; he added, not hiding his disappointment: ‘atque de Bathauia ferme descripsit nulla’: Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, II, p. 332 (ep. 458).

776 Hermans, *Olandie Gelrieque bellum*, fol. 1v: ‘Hec prefatus fuerim quod aliquando annuentibus superis totam olandi e historiam edere constitui, nunc ea dumtaxat exponam qua Charolo gelro aliquot annis gesta fuerunt.’

777 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r: ‘Willem Hermans’, p. 185.

778 Leijenhorst, ‘Willem Hermans’, p. 185.

779 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 2r: ‘Dese wilhelmus heeft veel boecken ghemaect ende laten drucken’.

780 Erasmus, *Silva carminum*, ed. Reinier Snoy (Gouda, 1513) contained Willem Hermans’s *Prosopopeia Hollandiae*, pp. 24-31, and could also have provided Jan with a link to Aurelius, as it holds the *Apologia Herasmi et Cornelii ... adversus barbaros*, pp. 15-22.

781 See above, n. 763.

started their careers at the monastery of Gouda (Willem Hermans had stayed behind when Erasmus, who had entered the monastery about the same time, moved on) and Gaguin, a leading humanist and historian of Paris, may have strengthened Jan’s belief that a third person also played a crucial role in making public the historical knowledge of the Gouda circle of humanists: the Augustinian canon at the monastery of Lopsen, Cornelius Aurelius, himself born in Gouda.

Jan could have known his name, and his interest in history, from a poem in Hermans’s *Silva odarum* addressed to him,\(^{783}\) and also from a letter and poem by Aurelius included in the edition of Gaguin’s *Compendium*, on which Jan had drawn as a source for his first chronicle.\(^{784}\) There, Jan had already referred to a letter of Erasmus which was attached to the same work:

The learned Gaguin, who has very eloquently written the chronicle of France (at the end of which Erasmus, whom [I] mentioned in the prologue, has written a wonderful letter in which he greatly praises Gaguin for his labour and calls him a credit to the French).\(^{785}\)

\(^{783}\) Ibid., sig. c1v: ‘Ode monocolos Asclepiadea Choriambica catalectica ex spondeo duobus Choriambis et pirhicio siue Jambo, ad Cornelium Goudensem virum non vulgariter litteratum, sibique studiorum communium societate copulatissimum.’

\(^{784}\) Gaguin, *Compendium*, fol. 309r: ‘Ad Robertum Gaguinum ordinis sanctae trinitatis ministrum generalem Cornelii Girardi goudensis Hieronymianae vallis Canonici regularis Epistola in laudem compendii eiusdem quod de gallia rebus accuratissime aedidit.’ This could have been Jan’s source of information for linking Aurelius to Lopsen. ‘Van Lopsen’ or ‘Lopsenus’ are not attested in print at the time Jan wrote. See P. C. Molhuysen, ‘Cornelius Aurelius’, *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkgeschiedenis*, n.s. 2 (1909), pp. 1-35; n.s. 4 (1911), pp. 54-73; C. P. Burger Jr, ‘De oudste Hollandsche wereldkaart, een werk van Cornelius Aurelius’, *Het boek*, 2e reeks, 5 (1916) pp. 33-66. Erasmus’s letter first appeared at the end of the first edition of Gaguin’s *Compendium* (1495), e.g., London, British Library, shelfmark G.6233, sig. r8r-v; in the second edition, it was moved to beginning (1497, e.g., BL shelfmark IB.41937, sigs a3v-a4r); in the third edition, it remained at the beginning, and Aurelius’s letter and poem were placed at the end (1497, e.g., BL IB.40223, sigs a3v-a4r [Erasmus], r5r-v [Aurelius]). In the fourth edition, the letters of both Erasmus and Aurelius appeared at the end of the text (1500, e.g., BL shelfmark IB.40988, sigs f2r-f3r [Erasmus], f3v-f4r [Aurelius]). They then appear in the later quarto editions (e.g., 1507, BL shelfmark 1441.b.1, fol 307r-309r [Erasmus], 309r-311r [Cornelius]). Jan used an edition which has Erasmus’s letter at the end of Gaguin’s chronicle; this rules out the second and third editions. The phrase Jan ascribes to Erasmus, describing Gaguin as ‘een eer der fransoijsen’ (see n. 785 below), does not have a direct parallel in Erasmus’s letter, but it does occur (‘historiae princeps et gloria Franciae’) in a poem about Gaguin by Jodocus Badius Ascensius (Josse Bade) which appears near Erasmus’s letter only in those editions which have both Erasmus’s and Cornelius’s letters at the end, followed by the poem. By this time, Jan could also have found Erasmus and Willem Hermans connected in a new publication: *Fabularum quæ hoc libro continentur interpretæ atque authores, sunt hi: Guilielmus Goudanus, Hadrianus Barlandus, Erasmus Roterodamus, Aulus Gellius, Angelus Politianus, Petrus Crinitus, Ioannes Antonius Campanus, Plinius Secundus Nouocomensis. Aesopi vita ex Max. Planude excerpta* (Strasbourg, [1515]).

\(^{785}\) MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, 66r: ‘Ende oecch die gehelerde Gaguinun dewelc die cronijck van vrancrijc zeer oratoerlic beschreuen heeft (daer herasmus int proloech ghenoemt een heerlicke epistel in beschreuen heeft int laetste daer hij dese gauinun zeer in prijst van sijnen arbeijt ende noemt hem een eer der fransoijsen)’. 
He did not mention Aurelius at this point, perhaps because the name did not yet ring a bell – Aurelius had nowhere near the stature of Erasmus. His only other published works were a letter in a Latin grammar, which Jan is unlikely to have consulted,\textsuperscript{786} and a poem co-written with Erasmus, which is never referred to by Jan.\textsuperscript{787}

When, within three years of Jan completing his first chronicle, another chronicle of Holland was published, which included information concerning the county’s history not known to him in spite of his exhaustive trawl of the printed sources, he probably surmised that the volume was based on Willem Hermans of Gouda’s unpublished chronicle, which he had learnt about in the latter’s short historical treatise about the recent war between Holland and Guelders. And when, in the \textit{Divisiekroniek}, he came across the name of another humanist, who was also connected to Gouda and whose name he had also encountered in the poetry of Willem Hermans and in a letter which appeared next to one by Erasmus in the chronicle of Robert Gaguin, confirming an interest in historiography, it may have led Jan to connect the dots and come to the conclusion that it was Cornelius Aurelius who had finally published the historical information collected by Hermans.

While modern scholars have seized on this attribution of the \textit{Divisiekroniek} to Aurelius as evidence for his authorship of the work, for Jan himself, its main importance was that it established a connection between the putative chronicle of Holland by Willem Hermans and the \textit{Divisiekroniek}, which, as he evidently believed, distinguished the new printed chronicle from the one he himself had recently completed. So keen was Jan on this connection that he was apparently willing to ignore the inconvenient facts that Hermans’s chronicle was not mentioned in the \textit{Divisiekroniek} and that its author stated quite clearly in the prologue that he had based his history principally on the chronicle of Holland of Johannes a Leydis (‘Brother Jan van Leyden, of the Order of Carmelites or Brethren of Our Lady at Haarlem, whom I have followed in this chronicle and translated from Latin into Dutch’),\textsuperscript{788} a work which was unknown to Jan. Given that it has been amply

\textsuperscript{786} The grammar is Martinus de Gouda’s \textit{Compendium latini ideomatis Martinianum} (Schoonhoven, 1509) the single surviving copy of which is Brussels, Koninklijke Bibliotheek/Bibliothèque Nationale, Inc. A 853; see Goudriaan, ‘Gouda Circle’, p. 160.


\textsuperscript{788} \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fol. b.v: ‘broeder Jan van Leyden vander oerden der Carmeliten ofte onser Vrouwen broeders tot Haerlem, den welken ic desen cronyken seer gheuolcht ende wten Latine in Duytssche ghetranslateert ende ouer gheset hebbe’.
demonstrated that Jan was wrong about the principal source of the *Divisiekroniek*, it is rather striking that scholars have never seriously questioned the reliability of his comments about the work’s authorship. Regardless of whether Cornelius Aurelius was, in reality, the author of the *Divisiekroniek*, Jan’s attribution may have been nothing more than guesswork based on information about the Gouda circle of humanists which he had culled from their printed works.

JAN VAN NAALDWIJK AND THE *DIVISIEKRONIEK*

In the prologue to his second chronicle, Jan describes this new work as a supplement to his first chronicle, containing the material in the *Divisiekroniek* which was not covered in his previous book:

> Because its [i.e., the *Divisiekroniek*’s] contents please me and are enjoyable to anyone who likes to read histories and chronicles or to hear them read out loud, and because it also contains many things that I have not touched upon or described in my own chronicle, I, Jan van Naaldwijk, will therefore in this present book and chronicle describe and mention whatever I have omitted in the other chronicle because I did not know the complete account or had not endeavoured to know it, or did not have in my possession or was not able to obtain the books that could clarify it.

Yet, Jan went on to present his second chronicle not only as a derivative supplement – a selection of those parts of the *Divisiekroniek* which contained new information not included in his previous work and which was intended to be read alongside it – but also as a chronicle in its own right, with its own rationale; and it is in this final part of his prologue that we find the clearest sign that his reading of the *Divisiekroniek*, as well as providing additional historical data about Holland, had influenced him on a more

---

789 Tilmans, *Historiography*, particularly pp. 89-90; Tilmans, ‘Hollandse kroniek’. Fruin, ‘Samensteller’, pp. 118-19, assumed that Jan’s comments about Hermans’s chronicle were correct.

790 The only recent exception is Gerritsen, ‘Jan Seversz’, who consistently refers to the ‘author of the *Divisiekroniek*’.

791 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 1v: ‘Ende want mijn die materi wel behaecht, ende gheneochghelic is voer den ghenen die gaern historijen ende cronijcken lezen ende hoeren lezen, ende want daer oek voel in staet daer je in mijn cronijck nijet van en hebbe gheroert noch bescreuen Soe wil je jan van naaldwick jn dit teghenwoerdighe boeck ende cronijck bescriuen ende menci maken vant gheen dat je in die andere cronijck ouergeslaghen hebbe om dat je daer gheen volcomen bescheijt en wiste ende oek gheen arbeijt en hadde ghedaen om dat te weten noch oek die boecken nijet en hadde noch en wist te vinden noch te crighen om dat int licht te breghen’.
fundamental level. It inspired him to express why the subject of these chronicles was particularly important to him personally:

Also, taking into account that I am a Hollander, my nature should reasonably be more inclined to describe the chronicles of Holland than of other lands and nations. For this reason, I will add much from various books, authors, documents and letters in this present chronicle, humbly beseeching everyone who reads this chronicle, or hears it read out loud, to excuse my ignorance if they find any error in it or anything that is not according to the truth.\textsuperscript{792}

The preface thus concludes with two of the most common topoi found in introductions to medieval historiographical texts: a statement of the many sources which informed his text – in this case, as we shall see below, rather overstating the true extent of Jan’s labours – and a plea for corrections, not dissimilar to the one contained in the prologue to his first chronicle, although this time mentioning that the text might also be heard as well as read. These two comments are preceded, however, by a remarkable statement, explaining that the choice of subject of the chronicle is linked to the national identity of its author.

‘Nation’, the term used by Jan in this passage, is a very contentious (and occasionally confusing) term in historical scholarship of the late medieval and early modern period. This is mostly because the medieval and modern meanings of the word differ fundamentally and because the period of transition from the former to the latter was lengthy and haphazard. Moreover, historians have long had a stake in propagating the idea of continuity between pre-modern and modern ‘peoples’ and ‘nations’.\textsuperscript{793} Throughout the Middle Ages, the term natio was primarily used in a narrow sense, denoting a group of people from one particular region living in another; so, for example, medieval universities contained nationes of visiting students from the various parts of Europe. These nationes were not necessarily strictly defined on an ethnic, linguistic or

\textsuperscript{792} Ibid.: ‘An merckende oeck dat je een hollaender bin soe hoert mijn natuer meer gheneijcht te zijn doer gherechte reden te bescriuen die chronijcken van hollant dan van anderen landen ende nacijen Doer welcke reden je in deze teghenwoerdtighe chronijck noch voel adderen ende toe doen sal wt verscheijen boecken autoeren ghescriften ende brieuen Bidendende oetmoedelicken alle den ghenen die deze cronijck lezen off hoeren lezen mijn onwetenheijt excuseren ende verantwoerden willen jndijen sjy daer jet in vinden daer in ghedwaelt is ende die waerheijt in is ghespaert’.

political level. Students from the Dutch Low Countries usually belonged to the German (or, in Paris, English) natio; and no Dutch natio, or one representing Holland, or even the Burgundian Low Countries, ever existed. Towards the end of the Middle Ages, however, the term natio began to acquire a new meaning, more akin to its modern definition, as a people with its own definite identity, inhabiting a particular territory.

Not surprisingly, history writing is the genre in which such a new definition of ‘nation’ was first expressed. The phrase ‘the recorded deeds of peoples and nations’ is a commonplace to describe historical works from at least the twelfth century onwards. Nevertheless, while these new connotations were perhaps clear in the minds of some authors, it should not be assumed that they had already crystallized by the second decade of the sixteenth century. In the absence of contradictory evidence, therefore, the meaning of the word nacie in the prologue to Jan’s second chronicle should be interpreted as analogous to its usage in the Middle Ages, for example in the medieval universities, and as an historiographical topos: in other words, not as a politically defined people in the modern sense (with statehood as inherent aim), but as a people with vaguely delineated shared characteristics (geographical origin, shared descent, political affiliation, language, etc.), primarily identified in contrast to other peoples – as we have seen in the previous chapter, Jan’s bookshelf was creaking under the weight of what we would call ‘foreign’ histories; furthermore, he claimed to have written three histories dealing with regions other than Holland. It is no wonder, then, that he could conceive of the people who inhabited Holland, a territory about which histories could be written, as a ‘nation’. While he narrowed the definition of natio to such an extent that it could be confined to the (political) borders of the county of Holland, it was its juxtaposition to other landen (‘lands’) that made it possible for him to define Holland as a nacie (‘nation’).

---


795 There is evidence, nonetheless, that students from Holland were associated with the county: A. Tervoort, Iter Italicum and the Northern Netherlands: Dutch Students at Italian Universities and their Role in the Netherlands’ Society (1426-1575) (Leiden, 2005), pp. 190-96. On the other hand, these students most often identified themselves by town of origin, and they were, regardless, members of the German natio.

796 This is also the case in the Dutch language: E. Verwijs and J. Verdam, Middelnederlands woordenboek, on the CD-ROM Middelnederlands (The Hague and Antwerp, 1998), s.v. ‘Nacie’, give the definition ‘Geslacht, volk, volksstam’ (‘Lineage, people, race’) as sixteenth-century usage.


798 See above, Chapter 2, pp. 153-154.

799 See also S. Groenveld, ‘“Natie” en “patria” bij zestiende-eeuwse Nederlanders’, in N. C. F. van Sas (ed.), Vaderland (Amsterdam, 1999), pp. 55-81, who argues that local identities overshadowed regional
The author of the *Divisiekroniek* did not even go this far in claiming for his work the role of a ‘national’ history. One particular passage, however, may have given Jan the idea for his comments:

Although many Latin chronicles have been written for Latinate and learned men, there are also some clever lay people, who do not know Latin but read about such deeds as eagerly as scholars do, and occasionally, depending on the circumstances, they may need to know them. Not many Dutch chronicles about the lands of Holland, Zeeland and Friesland are to be found, because in the past such books were considered to be a valuable and secret treasure and kept as such; that is why I want to write this book in the Dutch language. Every human being, according to his natural leanings, is more inclined towards his own region and its affairs, and he especially prefers to hear about where he was born and raised, his forefathers’ honourable, courageous facts, deeds and histories, than about those of foreigners.

Defences of writing in the vernacular frequently crop up in Middle Dutch literature; and it seems that such justifications remained common in the late fifteenth century, despite the increasing availability of learning in the vernacular – although there may have been an increased emphasis on the possibility of erudition without Latinity among readers of vernacular texts. The author of the *Divisiekroniek* does not, however, aim to justify the

---

800 Cf. Tilmans, *Historiography*, pp. 141-2, who is circumspect in her formulation (I suspect because the *Divisiekroniek* never straightforwardly states its ‘national’ agenda): ‘What emerged, or rather, what the author attempted to achieve was a popular or “national” chronicle.’

801 *Divisiekroniek*, fol. b.r (prologue): ‘Ende al ist datter vele latijnssche croniken gescreuen sijn voer den latijnsscen ende geleerde mannen, so vintmen oec enige cloecke ende vernuftige leke luyden, die geen latijn en verstaen, ende lesen also gaern van sulcken gesten als die gheleerden, ende gheualt bi wiln dattet hem van node si na geheleghenheit der saken die te weten Ende also men alte weynich duytsche croniken vint der voerseyder landen van Hollandt zeelant ende Vrieslant want voermaels sulke boecken voer een costlic ende heimelic scat ghehouden ende bewaert worden, daer om wil ic dit boeck scruien in duytscher spraken Want een ygelic mensch na sjijnder natuerlicker geyenychtheit, is hi meer inclineert ende ghneyghet tot sine eygen lantscap ende dat dat angaende, ende sonderlinge hoert hi lieuer van daer hi gheboren ende op gheuoeedt is, sijnre voeranderen erlicke manlicke feyten wercken ende gheschienissen, dan vanden vremeend’.

writing of a chronicle in the vernacular; what he says is that such chronicles have been written before but are not easily available, because they were regarded as too valuable for wider circulation. Of course, it was not primarily the value of manuscripts, but instead the complications of dissemination of texts by manual copying which made manuscript chronicles relatively rare in absolute quantities, at least compared to the potential output of the printing press, and irrespective of their language. We should probably assume, therefore, that the author was contrasting his printed chronicle to manuscript ones, rather than comparing Latin histories to works in the vernacular.

Nor is the author’s subsequent remark about the inclination of people towards the history of their own region an expression of ‘national’ sentiment but, instead, an expectation of an interest among his readership in regional history. He understood that his decision to write in the vernacular put a limit on the range of subjects it was appropriate for him to cover. The reverse of this argument served as an advertisement for the chronicle. He did not set out to write a ‘national’ chronicle of Holland because he himself was a Hollander; rather, he justified adopting the vernacular of Holland because of the potential market of educated laymen for a chronicle which was concerned with the history of their own region. Jan’s second chronicle confirms the author’s expectation, even though Jan, knowing Latin well enough to translate from it himself, was not the kind of lay reader he had in mind.

Jan’s response to the passage shows that he was a keen reader of the Divisiekroniek, absorbing the author’s comments about the work’s intended audience and applying them to himself and the circumstances of his own authorship. In doing so, he appropriated statements in ways which the author himself would not have anticipated. As a reader of the Divisiekroniek, Jan accepted the author’s premise that people would naturally be interested to hear about the history of their own region. But he then took the argument a step further: as a ‘Hollander’, he was naturally inclined not only to be interested in hearing about his county’s history, as the author of the Divisiekroniek had hoped, but also in writing about it. Jan, therefore, seems to have reinterpreted the author’s observation about language and audience as a statement about authorship and identity. As we shall see below, this would not be the last time he took the text of the Divisiekroniek in directions not intended by its author.

Dutch vernacular; their continued manuscript diffusion shows that the debate retained its relevance throughout the fifteenth century.
Fig. 24: *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 1r

Just as he made small changes to the ‘Dutch Beke’ in his first chronicle, so Jan followed the same procedure when taking over material from the *Divisiekroniek*. Occasional errors and corrections show that he made these minor alterations while writing the autograph manuscript now in the British Library. Jan made small changes in order to avoid apparent inconsistencies in the *Divisiekroniek* and to adjust its vocabulary to his own. He sometimes corrected details, based on his knowledge of other sources – one such correction shows that he probably still had access to the manuscript of Beke’s chronicle which he had used for his first chronicle. Other minor insertions added narrative flourish: for example, a reference to someone ‘making water’ was too decorous, so he rephrased it, writing that the person ‘began to piss and make water like a reed cat’. In another episode, he avoided one of the *Divisiekroniek*’s circumlocutions by stating straightforwardly that Count Floris V had ‘raped the beautiful

---

803 E.g., *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 170r (div. 18, cap. 20), ‘daer om heeft margriete dye graefinne worgenoemt den graue van ghijzen den graue van bromo met gwien ende met Johan van dampier hoer zonen ghesent in vrancrijck in bourgongen’; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 71v, ‘doer rade ghesonden den graeff van ghijzen den graeff van bromo met gwien ende met johan van dampijer hoer zonen <-gheseijnt> in vrancrijck in borgongen’ (‘gheseijnt’ first written, then deleted by the author). Jan’s rephrasing of the beginning of the sentence made unnecessary the *Divisiekroniek*’s ‘ghesent’; at first instance, however, Jan forgot to omit the word, which he deleted afterwards. Conversely, *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 190r (div. 21, cap. 8): ‘ende worde ten lestten ouermits enen oploep van der ghemeijnten mit groter confusien en de scanden wten landen van vlaanderen verdreuen ende veriaecht’; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 83r: ‘Waerom hij ten laetsten doer enen oploep van der ghemeijnten mit groter scanden ende lachter wt den landen van vlaanderen verdreuen ende veriaecht <+wart>’ (‘wart’ later added by the author).

804 E.g., a change in the appearance of the writing on MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 42v, which coincides with a page break – and thus a convenient place to pause copying – in the *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 129r-v (div. 10, cap. 8).

805 E.g., *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 8v (div. 1, cap. 8) somewhat contradictorily maintained that Brutus ‘dedet [i.e., Albion] na siden naeme tot een eewighe memorie hieten brittangen datmen nu enghelant noemt’; Jan, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 9v, omitted ‘dat men Enghelant noemt’. As in his first chronicle, Jan favours modern forms of names over archaic ones found in his source. He avoids the oral *topoi* ‘voerscreven’, one on occasion even, erroneously, within direct speech (*Divisiekroniek* fol. 117r [div. 7, cap. 12], ‘coninc Kaerl voerseit’; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 35r, ‘keijser kaerl voerscreuen’). Dialectal alterations are, e.g., ‘vrunden’ for the *Divisiekroniek*’s ‘vrienden’; ‘sunte’ for ‘sinte’; ‘hartoge’/’hartoch’ for ‘hertoge’; ‘voel’ for ‘vele’; ‘-ouwe’ for ‘-oude’; ‘wart’ for ‘wert’; ‘hoer’ for ‘hoir’/’hair’; ‘-eij’ for ‘-ee’; ‘-ije’ for ‘-ee’; ‘-ij’ for ‘-ee’; ‘achteren’ for ‘afteren’; ‘v’ and ‘ghij’ for ‘di’.

806 At MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 41r, a passage otherwise copied verbatim from *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 131v (div. 10, cap. 13), Jan preferred the calculations and dates found in Beke, *Croniken*, p. 66 (cap. 45), silently correcting the *Divisiekroniek*’s information; he had omitted these details in his first chronicle: MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 31v.

807 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 84r: ‘began te seijken ende sijn water zeer te maken ghelijck een rijet kater’, from *Divisiekroniek*, 190r (div. 21, cap. 9): ‘began wtermaten sere zijn water te maken’.

---
wife’ of his vassal Gerard van Velsen, instead of repeating that the count had ‘achieved his objective and will with this woman’.

**Questioning Humanist Historiography: The Batavians**

Many of Jan’s alterations to what he found in the *Divisiekroniek* were far more drastic – and more significant. While, as we have seen, he (mis-)appropriated some theoretical comments from the *Divisiekroniek*, he did not accept, or saw no use for, many of its central historical arguments. Jan indicated in his prologue that he was interested in the *Divisiekroniek* because it was a product of the learning of the circle of scholars connected to Erasmus. Nevertheless, his treatment of several key issues in the *Divisiekroniek* shows that he valued the humanist influence on historiography for different reasons from those emphasized by modern scholars. Despite what he says in the prologue, Jan’s second chronicle is not, in reality, a collection of all the passages from the *Divisiekroniek* containing material about Holland which had not been included in his first chronicle. It is, instead, a selection of particular parts of the *Divisiekroniek*, occasionally rewritten to suit his own aims, with the addition of a small number of passages from other sources.

Perhaps the most dramatic contrast between what Jan saw as significant and what modern scholars have regarded as important, as well as ‘humanist’, about the *Divisiekroniek* is apparent in the opening chapters of his chronicle. When reading the *Divisiekroniek* in light of his first chronicle and the historiographical tradition on which it was based, Jan would, no doubt, have noticed significant departures from the outset, since the first *divisie* contains perhaps the most striking differences from Jan’s first chronicle. It starts with the history of creation (Fig. 24), including an account of the Flood, the subsequent repopulation of the world and the dispersion of its peoples; in this, the *Divisiekroniek* followed the example of late medieval universal chronicles. As a whole, the first *divisie* gives the impression of having been written by an author who, more than any previous chronicler of Holland, was deeply interested in legendary origin stories: he incorporated several of them in his work, irrespective of whether they were compatible

---

808 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 76r: ‘Ende te wijl dat hij wt was heeft die graeff sijn scone wijff vercracht’.

809 *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 182v (div. 19, cap. 22): ‘sinen opsetten ende wille, mit deser vrouwen gedaen ende volbrocht’.

810 *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 1r-5r (div. 1, cap. 1-5); cf. Hartmann Schedel, *Liber cronicarum* (Nuremberg, 1493), fol. 1r-14r; Jacobus Philippus Foresti Bergomensis, *Supplementum supplementi chronicarum* (Venice, 1506), fol. 3r-21r. The text of the opening of the *Divisiekroniek* (fol. 1r) is primarily based on Jan Veldener’s *Fasciculus temporum* (Utrecht, 1480), fol. 1r.
with each other, and he theorized about their reliability and even about the reasons for including such stories in chronicles.\textsuperscript{811} In doing so, he created a narrative and chronicle structure which was repetitive and frequently contradictory, since he was apparently unable to digest properly the information accessible to him in his various sources.\textsuperscript{812}

Later interest in the \textit{Divisiekroniek} has concentrated on the inclusion, for the first time in a chronicle of Holland, of the Batavians as ancestors of the Hollanders, generally regarded as the aspect of the work most indicative of humanist influence.\textsuperscript{813} The story was principally based on Cornelius Aurelius’s interpretation of passages in Tacitus’s \textit{Germania}, \textit{Histories} and \textit{Annals}.\textsuperscript{814} Aurelius’s two brief, unpublished Latin tracts on the Batavian question were translated into Dutch and included in the \textit{Divisiekroniek}.\textsuperscript{815} These tracts provided the groundwork for the story of the Batavians: their origin in Eastern Europe; the disputes which they had with their neighbours that led them to migrate to an island at the North Sea coast; their leaders Battus and Salandus and their foundation of the first cities in the region; the geographical description of the island of the Batavians; the account of the character of its inhabitants and their position within the Roman Empire; and the revolt led by Claudius Civilis.\textsuperscript{816} Since this story would become the central origin myth for the nascent Dutch Republic in the late sixteenth century,\textsuperscript{817} much

\textsuperscript{811} \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fols 4r, 15r-17r (div. 1, cap. 4, 19, 20).

\textsuperscript{812} E.g., the claim ‘dat in desen landen van Hollant ende Zeelant ghene steden, sloten, noch burgen geweest en zijn voer Julius Cesars ende Octaviaens tijden’ (ibid., fols 16v-17r [div. 1, cap. 20]) is at odds with chapters describing the foundation of ‘een alten groten ende swaren stad’ north of Utrecht (fol. 11v [div. 1, cap. 13]) and of the ‘Slav’s Fortress’ (ibid., div. 1, cap. 21).

\textsuperscript{813} See above, nn. 35 and 36.


\textsuperscript{816} \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fols 11r-13v (div. 1, capp. 10-17).

modern interest in the *Divisiekroniek* has been fixated on this material.\(^{818}\) The concentration in the secondary literature on the Batavian origin story, which makes up little more than one percent of the complete chronicle and which is not mentioned in the summary description in its prologue,\(^{819}\) indicates something of the one-sidedness of the work’s scholarly reception.

Given this imbalance, it is important to point out that many key ingredients of the Batavian narrative had already been present in historical writing about Holland for several centuries: as we have seen, historians working in the tradition based on Beke’s chronicle had long made modest attempts to root the origins of the Hollanders in a more distant, and specifically a more classical past; moreover, fifteenth-century innovations had involved a story of migration and settlement.\(^{820}\) Most importantly, ever since Beke himself, the relation between the ancient Hollanders and the Roman Empire had been a direct one;\(^{821}\) and in this, the Batavian myth was no exception. Echoing a sentiment that had resonated throughout the chronicle tradition of Holland, the *Divisiekroniek* says of the Batavians that they were ‘free and did not owe any tax, levy or tribute’.\(^{822}\) Seen within the context of Holland’s historical tradition, the Batavian myth was an old story, retold in a humanist vocabulary, part of a continuous tradition of historiographical experimentation from at least the middle of the fourteenth century onwards.

Furthermore, the widespread belief that the Batavians in the *Divisiekroniek* represent a collective, ‘national’, origin of the Hollanders, or even the Dutch,\(^{823}\) is based on the

---


\(^{819}\) *Divisiekroniek*, prologue, fol. a.v-b.v.

\(^{820}\) See above, Chapter 1, pp. 57-58, 67; Chapter 2, pp. 91, 106.

\(^{821}\) See above, Chapter 1, pp. 36, 38, 47, 51, 58, 59, 67.

\(^{822}\) *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 12v (div. 1, cap. 16): ‘soe bleuen si vrij ende saten sonder enige thijns scattinge oft tribuit te geuen’. See above Chapter 1, pp. 38, 58, 61 and 67 for the history of descriptions of the region’s people as being ‘free and without tribute’.

assumption that the way the chronicle was read in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was already in place on its first publication in 1517. Nor does such a reading take into account the very fragmented story of Holland’s origins presented in the *Divisiekroniek*. It is worth stressing that, in the *Divisiekroniek*, the Batavian myth did not replace, but was instead added to, the narratives already found in earlier chronicles of Holland. Moreover, the Batavians were certainly not treated as the collective forebears of all the people of the region or even of the county:

Thus, there are four or five nations of peoples in Holland, namely: the Batavians, situated below Gorichom; the Wilts, below Dordrecht, with South Holland; the Catwijkers and Rhinelanders, below Leiden; the Kennemers, situated below Haarlem, including North Holland; the Frisians or Waterlanders, adjacent to Amsterdam. Nowadays, these are altogether called Hollanders, and the province the county of Holland. You have now heard about the origin, beginning, description, situation and condition of the land of Holland and of its inhabitants, namely the Batavians, Wilts, Catwijkers, Kennemers, Frisians and Waterlanders.

The author recounted not only the Batavian story, but also all the other narratives that were available to him about the earliest history of the region. Moreover, he himself was explicitly sceptical about using history for propagandistic purposes – ‘whether all of this is true I leave to scholars to decide, because every nation and race desires to have the most ancient origin’, he remarks at one point – while, at the same time, relishing the opportunity to tell as many origin stories about the region as he could find in his sources. An entire chapter is devoted to explaining the existence of these different, and often contradictory, stories.


824 E.g., *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 17r-v (div. 1, cap. 21): the foundation of the Slav’s Fortress by the giants of Albion. See also Schöffer, ‘The Batavian Myth’, p. 91.

825 *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 15r (div. 1, cap. 19): ‘Aldus sjijnder iij. oft v. nacyen van volck in hollant. als batauiers legghende onder gorichom. wilten leggende onder dordrecht mit suythollant catwijkers ende rijnlanders legghende onder leyden. kenemers legghende onder haarlem mit noorthollandt. vriesen ofte waterlanders. leggende neffens amstelredam. die men nochtans alle gader onder enen ghemenen name noemt hollanders ende dye prouincie het graefschap van hollant. Nu hebdij gehoert vanden oersprong merklichte. beghinsele descripcye. situacye ende ghelegentheyt des lants van hollandt. vanden inwoenres als batauiers. wilten. catwijkers kennemers vriesen. ende waterlanders.’ The diversity reflected in the passage is also noted by Kampinga, *Opvattingen*, p. 58.

826 *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 4r (div. 1, cap. 4): ‘wat hier van ... sij beuele ic den gheelerden. want elcke nacie ende gheslachte begeert die outste haercoemst te hebben’.

827 Ibid., fols 15v-17r (div. 1, cap. 20).
From the start of his chronicle, it is clear that Jan’s aim was not merely to present a selection of passages from the *Divisiekróniek*: he gave his work the shape he believed a chronicle of Holland should have, even when this was in disagreement with his principal source and inspiration. Deviating from the structure of the *Divisiekróniek*, which started with creation, Jan began his second chronicle, as he had done his first chronicle, with a description of the region (Fig. 19). For the description, he brought together two chapters which are somewhat awkwardly separated in the *Divisiekróniek*, whose author had made no attempt to integrate the passages which he took from Aurelius’s Batavian treatises with those adopted from the chronicle tradition, resulting in two *descriptiones* placed in different chapters of the first *divisie*. Although Jan would have recognized some of the material in these two *descriptiones* from Beke, since he had used the same passage from the ‘Dutch Beke’ in his first chronicle, he nevertheless decided to include it in his second chronicle (while omitting a third and quite different *description* found in the fourth *divisie* – one which was, in fact, more suitable for his supplement because it contained ‘new’ information). Apparently, he wanted to create a work which would at least seem coherent on its own as a chronicle of Holland.

At the very beginning of the *description*, Jan made a small but significant alteration to the text of the *Divisiekróniek*, leaving out the observation that Holland ‘used to be called Batavia’. It was evidently not the innovations concerning the pre-history of Holland, including the Batavian myth, which attracted him to the work, since he did not incorporate in his own chronicle any of the remarks about the variety of origin myths,

---

828 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 20r.
829 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 8r-v; material from *Divisiekróniek*, fols 14v-15r (div. 1, cap. 19), about the trades of Holland, is inserted into an account of the county’s geography and the ethnography of its people found there on fol. 11r (div. 1, cap. 10).
830 Cf. ibid., fol. 11r (div. 1, cap. 10); MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 8r-v; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 20r; Jan Beke, *Chronographia*, ed. H. Bruch (The Hague, 1973), p. 9 (cap. 5); Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 8-9 (cap. 5). The author of the *Divisiekróniek* took the information from Johannes a Leydis, who had it from Beke.
831 Jan omits *Divisiekróniek*, fols 91r-92v (div. 4, cap. 5), ‘Een voer redene vanden graueslickhede van hollandt.’
832 Jan omits, for example, *Divisiekróniek*, div. 1, capp. 14 (‘Hoe datmen oec hollant ende zeelant vint in anderen landen ende natien’), 20 (‘Van die opinie der gheenre die scriuen vanden beghinne anuang ende oerspronc deser landen van hollant ende zeelant’), as well comments such as that on fol. 36v (div. 2, cap. 18), that ‘sommige willen seggen dat dese anthonis dede oec maken die grote stad geheten duersteden ... hoe wel dat enige andere seggen dat battus oft batauus een prinche der cathan dese stadt gemaec soude hebben ... als ick hier voer gescreuen hebbe, mer wat hier van is beuele ie den gheeleerd ende experten historij scriuers’, and that on fols 49v-50r (div. 2, cap. 29): ‘Andere croniken seggen dat dit slot te britten
nor any material about universal creation history. These omissions can be explained by a desire to limit himself more narrowly to subject matter related to Holland. Nevertheless, if we see Jan’s reading of the *Divisiekroniek* as an attempt to come to terms with the products of new learning it is hard to understand why he chose to ignore a large part of the material in the *Divisiekroniek* on the Batavian origin myth. In his first chronicle, as we have seen in the previous chapter, Jan had been eager to expand the confines of Holland’s history, for instance, by embracing information concerning the noble houses which held the title Count of Holland in his own time. Yet, now, he was apparently less interested in widening the scope of his second chronicle by taking over the *Divisiekroniek*’s presentation of the origin stories of the peoples of the region.

This is not to say that he altogether rejected the Batavian legend: further on, Jan mentions Batavia as the earlier name of Holland, and he also provides a brief account of the origins of the Batavians and their migration to the North Sea coast, rearranging the somewhat confused narrative in the *Divisiekroniek* in order to present a more consistent chronology. But he does omit most of the chapters on the Batavians, including: Cornelius Aurelius’s defence of the identification of Batavia with Holland; the lengthy discussion of the high esteem in which the Batavians were held in the Roman Empire; the ethnological account of the ancient Batavians; and, most importantly for the later mythology, the story of the Batavian revolt under their leader Claudius Civilis. Instead, Jan moves directly from his brief sketch of the migration of the Batavians to the material with which he was familiar and which, in the *Divisiekroniek*, had preceded the information about the Batavians: the migration of Brutus and the subsequent expulsion of the giants of Albion.

---

gebouwet soude wesen vanden keyser claudius als ic voer geseyt hebbe Wat nu hier of is beuele ic den ondersoekers van dien, tis mi genoech datmen weet dattet daer gestaen heeft ende die rijn daer inder zee hier voertijts geuloyet heeft.’

834 Jan omits *Divisiekroniek*, div. 1, capp. 1-7, 9.
835 *Divisiekroniek*, fols 11r-15r (div. 1, cap. 11-19).
836 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 8r-v, from *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 11r-v (div. 1, cap. 10-11), rearranged and including material from fols 14v-15r (div. 1, cap. 19); Jan takes over, from fol. 11r (div. 1, cap. 10), the comment that along the North Sea coast there are 100 islands, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 8v: ‘onder welcken batauia, dat nu hollant wart ghenoemt dat beste edelste, ende vroemste eijlant is van mannen’.
837 *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 11v (div.1, cap. 11), first mentions the migration and the landing at the North Sea coast, and only Afterwards explains why the Batavians left their region of origin; Jan tells the story chronologically, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 8v-9r.
838 Ibid., fol. 9r-v, with Brutus, which in the *Divisiekroniek* came before, not after, the Batavians, fols 7r-9r (div. 1, cap. 7-8).
All the information in the beginning of Jan’s second chronicle, apart from the prologue, comes from the *Divisiekroniek*; yet these opening pages actually resemble his first chronicle more than they do the *Divisiekroniek* (the author’s remark that stories about King Donkey’s Ears ‘are all made-up lies’ is predictably omitted by Jan, given his fondness for the tale, though he may well have appreciated the accompanying illustration, probably selected by the printer [Fig. 25]). Perhaps, therefore, we should be wary of taking at face value his claim that in the second chronicle he summarized those parts of the *Divisiekroniek* concerning the history of Holland that had not been covered in his previous chronicle. More than a mere summary, the second chronicle seems to be an attempt to portray and reshape the new material he had encountered in the *Divisiekroniek*. Moreover, his perception of what was ‘new’ about the *Divisiekroniek* is at odds with what scholars have identified as its innovative features.

![Fig. 25: King Donkey’s Ears according to the printer of the Divisiekroniek, fol. 49r](image)


---

839 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol 17v: ‘coninck aurindulius anders ghenoeamt coninc ezeloer’; *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 49r (div. 2, cap. 27): ‘aurindulius ... den welcken die leke luden noemen ezeloer om dat hi so lange oren hadde gelijck een ezel mer dit is al versierde logentael’.
Jan’s Use of the *Divisiekroniek*

Jan’s treatment of other significant episodes in Holland’s history confirm that, for the most part, he aimed to include what was new to him in the *Divisiekroniek* and to omit what he had already set out in his first chronicle, while at the same time maintaining a coherent chronology of the succession of the counts of Holland.\(^{840}\) A good example is provided by his treatment of the career of Count Willem II, emperor-elect, which had been the apex of Holland’s history in Beke’s *Chronographia* and the ensuing chronicle tradition of Holland.\(^{841}\) One of the stock pieces in the narration was the episode of Willem’s knighting ceremony; it included a short ‘mirror of princes’ in the form of a description of knighthood by the cardinal overseeing the ceremony, which Jan had copied in its entirety from the ‘Dutch Beke’ in his first chronicle.\(^{842}\) The *Divisiekroniek* also recounted the festivities and the knighting ceremony;\(^{843}\) but, in the second chronicle, Jan reduced the entire proceedings to a single sentence: ‘After this, he was knighted, with great festivities, by the King of Bohemia’\(^{844}\) – enough to present the basic elements of the story, but no more than was necessary to hold together the passages which contained sufficient new information to warrant being incorporated in full.

Jan had included the letters confirming the original donation of the county of Holland in his first chronicle,\(^{845}\) so, he did not regard it as necessary to reproduce them again. The *Divisiekroniek*, however, in addition to the letters, provided some brief explanatory notes.\(^{846}\) Jan used these explanations in his second chronicle, apparently recognizing that the author of the *Divisiekroniek* had made an effort to ensure that his history was as

---

\(^{840}\) E.g., at MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 9r-v, Jan abbreviates *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 8r-v, but gives in full the account of Corineus, fols 8v-9r (all from div. 1, cap 8): the events discussed in the former passage had been set out at length in his previous chronicle, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 20v, but those in the latter had not been mentioned. Further examples: the account of the life and death of Count Dirk IV, *Divisiekroniek*, div. 8, capp 3 and 6, which is abbreviated in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 36v, already having been told in full in MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 28r-29r, from Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 60-61 (cap. 41); Count Floris II’s battles against the Frisians, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 45v-46r, which are abbreviated from *Divisiekroniek*, div. 11, cap. 6, but recounted in MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 31v-32r, from the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’: *Die cronike of die hystorie van Hollant van Zeelant ende Vrieslant ende van den sticht van Utrecht* (Gouda, 1478), sigs d4r-d5r. The same procedure continues throughout the chronicle.

\(^{841}\) See above, Chapter 1, p. 39.

\(^{842}\) MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 52v-53v, from Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 121-3 (cap. 119).

\(^{843}\) *Divisiekroniek*, div. 18, cap. 5.

\(^{844}\) MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 70r: ‘Hijer na wart hij mit groter feesten van den coninck van bemen ridder gheslaghen’.

\(^{845}\) Ibid., fols 25v-26r.

\(^{846}\) E.g., *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 97r (div. 4, cap. 9): ‘Hier wt ist seker ende kenlick nader inhoudt van desen brief dat ...’; fol. 97v (div. 4, cap. 9): ‘Hier wt machmen wel verstaen dat ...’
accessible as possible: ‘I have given the contents of this letter in the great chronicle of Holland’, Jan wrote, ‘but because it contains certain terms and stipulations that are not understood by the common people, I will explain it here for you.’

This mention of his earlier history, referred to as ‘the great chronicle of Holland’, shows that Jan still saw his first chronicle as the main work and that he envisaged the second one primarily as a supplement, enabling him to expand the narrative presented in the first, sometimes by adding new information, sometimes by elucidating passages already covered there. Nevertheless, he only referred his readers to the more extensive account in his earlier work three times, otherwise treating the second chronicle as a consistent narrative from start to finish and therefore able to stand on its own.

Not all Jan’s abbreviations and omissions of episodes concerning Holland, even in the period of the counts, can be explained by their appearance in his first chronicle. One of the characteristics of the *Divisiekroniek* which has been identified as inspired by humanism, functioning as a ‘rhetorical tool’ used to ‘liven up the narrative’, was the inclusion of numerous documents confirming donations to religious establishments or agreements between regional princes recording their possessions; these were often appended to the end of chapters recounting the events that led to the drafting of such texts. Jan, however, generally omitted them, even when he took over the full account of the related events from the *Divisiekroniek*. This putatively humanist aspect of the *Divisiekroniek*’s historiography evidently did not appeal to Jan.

Jan, moreover, was not keen on the *Divisiekroniek*’s many long descriptions of battles and sieges, a popular feature of late medieval literature and historiography, but one

---

847 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 23r: ‘Ende van dit lant van hollant gaff hij hem seghel ende brijeffs welcke brijeff ende inhout ic bescreuen heb in die grote cronijck van hollant ende want daer sommighe termen ende verpalinghe in staen die de ghemeijne man nijet en verstaet soe sal je v daerom tverstant hijer van scriuen’. What follows is based on excerpts from *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 97r-v (div. 4, cap. 9) and fol. 97v (div. 4, cap. 10).

848 On the disputes between Holland and Utrecht about the Velue, he writes (MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 89v-90r) that ‘daer grote twist ende oerloghen om waren gheweest alsmen lezen mach in die ander cronijck van hollant ende want daer sommighe termen ende verpalinghe in staen die de ghemeijne man nijet en verstaet soe sal je v daerom tverstant hijer van scriuen’. On the Siege of Tournai (ibid., fol. 100v) that ‘hoer ghesellen ende heren hadden dicwijls schermutzinghe ende manghelinghe teghens een, die ene wan die ander verloer dat jc opt lanckste bescreuen heb in die ander cronijck’; on the siege and capture of Calais (ibid., fol. 118v) that ‘Dit beleg ende innemen van calijs heb jc in mijn ander cronijck van mijn ghemaect opt lanckste bescreuen’.

849 Tilmans, *Historiography*, p. 139.

850 E.g., *Divisiekroniek*, div. 7, cap. 7, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 34r; *Divisiekroniek*, div. 8, cap. 4, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 36v; *Divisiekroniek*, div. 10, cap. 9, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 41r-v; *Divisiekroniek*, div. 10, cap. 10, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 41v; *Divisiekroniek*, div. 11, cap. 5, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 46r.

851 Often accompanied by a generic image, e.g., *Divisiekroniek*, fols 245v, 257v (battle scene); 27v, 211v (assault).
which Beke had not favoured. Beke’s accounts of battles, with only a few exceptions, are brief and concise; Jan apparently chose to follow this convention rather than adopting the innovations presented by the *Divisiekroniek.*

Overall, about one out of every two chapters in the *Divisiekroniek* is omitted in its entirety from Jan’s second chronicle. Most of these omissions, however, occur in the first three *divisies*, where about four out of every five chapters are left out. This is largely due to Jan’s limiting himself to material strictly concerned with Holland, so that he excised most of the chapters on universal history, which played a prominent role in this part of the *Divisiekroniek*. Although he occasionally took information from the chapters on popes and emperors, he usually left them out entirely, even omitting references to

---

852 E.g., the abbreviated account of Count Floris I’s battles, from ibid., div. 9, cap. 4, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 37v. Beke, *Croniken*, p. 62 (cap. 43) has only: ‘In desen tiden, als in den jaer ons Heren m ende lxi, Florens die grave van Hollant ende een onvervaert prince, om wrake te doene van sinen broeder vergaderde hileen moghende heer ende toech tieghen die graven die sinen broeder ghedoodt hadden, die hi mit zeghe verwan ende onderdede, daer vele lude doot bleven'; MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 30r, has a slightly longer account based on the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sigs c8v-d1v, but lacking much of the *Divisiekroniek*’s detail; the abbreviated account of Count Dirk V’s siege of Stavoren, *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 128r (div. 10, cap. 7), in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 40v (this siege is not in Beke, *Croniken*, or MS Cotton Vitellius F xv).

853 *Divisiekroniek*, div. 1 (25 capp.): Jan omits 1-7, 9, 12, 14-18, 20, 23, 25; div. 2 (34 capp.): Jan omits 1-14, 16, 19, 20, 22-3, 25-6, 28, 30, 32, 34; div. 3 (95 capp.): Jan omits 1-21, 23-30, 32-92, 94-5; div. 4 (19 capp.): Jan omits 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 14, 16-18; div. 5 (21 capp.): Jan omits 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-12, 14, 15, 19; div. 6 (5 capp.): Jan omits 3; div. 7 (19 capp.): Jan omits 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 14, 18; div. 8 (6 capp.): Jan omits 1; div. 9 (9 capp.): Jan uses all; div. 10 (13 capp.): Jan omits 4, 12; div. 11 (12 capp.): Jan omits 7; div. 12 (22 capp.): Jan omits 4, 5, 11, 18-21; div. 13 (15 capp.): Jan omits 1, 3, 6-9; div. 14 (11 capp.): Jan omits 4-10; div. 15 (3 capp.): Jan omits 2, 3; div. 16 (11 capp.): Jan omits 3, 5, 7, 9, 10; div. 17 (15 capp.): Jan omits 3-9, 11, 12, 15; div. 18 (28 capp.): Jan omits 1-2, 5-6, 8, 11-12, 14, 16-19, 24-6; div. 19 (26 capp.): Jan omits 3, 5, 6, 8-12, 14, 16-18, 21, 23-5; div. 20 (14 capp.): Jan omits 1, 3, 4, 7-8, 11; div. 21 (24 capp.): Jan omits 1, 3-7, 11, 15, 19, 22, 24; div. 22 (34 capp.): Jan omits 1, 5, 11-13, 16-18, 21-2, 27-9, 32; div. 23 (16 capp.): Jan omits 1, 6-8, 11-13, 15; div. 24 (17 capp.): Jan omits 5-12; div. 25 (17 capp.): Jan omits 3-6, 9-15; div. 26 (58 capp.): Jan omits 12, 18-20, 22-3, 28-30, 32-3, 36-38, 40, 41, 44, 48-9, 54; div. 27 (26 capp.): Jan omits 1, 11, 14, 17, 20; div. 28 (49 capp.): Jan omits 1, 20, 22, 48; div. 29 (54 capp., Jan’s text runs to cap. 35): Jan omits 1, 3, 16, 18-19, 29, 32-3.


855 Jan uses excerpts from *Divisiekroniek*, div. 2, cap. 21, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 12r (invention of stained glass); *Divisiekroniek*, div. 7, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 30v; *Divisiekroniek*, div. 9, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 37r; *Divisiekroniek*, div. 10, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 39v-40r; *Divisiekroniek*, div. 11, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 44r-v (Knights Templars); *Divisiekroniek*, div. 12, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 47v-48r (portents); *Divisiekroniek*, div. 14, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 62v-63v (children’s and peasants’ crusade, miracles); *Divisiekroniek*, div. 16, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 65r-v (cold winter, famine, Teutonic Knights); *Divisiekroniek*, div. 17, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 78r; *Divisiekroniek*, div. 25, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 25r-v, 26v; *Divisiekroniek*, div. 26, cap. 1, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 148r.

856 *Divisiekroniek*, div. 2, cap. 14; div. 3, capp. 1, 16, 25, 36, 75-6, 80, 88, 90, 92; div. 4, capp. 1, 4; div. 5, cap. 1; div. 8, cap. 1; div. 13, cap. 1; div. 18, cap. 1; div. 20, cap. 1; div. 21, cap. 1; div. 22, cap. 1; div. 23, cap. 1; div. 27, cap. 1; div. 28, cap. 1; div. 29, cap. 1.
the birth of Christ. He took care to purge even the smallest hint of the Divisiekroniek’s imperial and papal framework: for instance, while he took a vision of a hermit and a narrative about bogus king from one of the papal chapters, and later on used a passage about a comet, a solar eclipse, earthquakes, famines and other portents from the same chapter, he carefully expunged any mention of the pope (Innocent VI) in whose reign these events occurred.

At one point, Jan indicates that the distinctive organization of the Divisiekroniek, where the universal historical material for a certain period is given, after which the material concerning the county starts afresh with the succession of the count at the beginning of that period – had caused him problems when he was excerpting from the work:

In the time of this Count Dirk, there appeared a large circle around the moon. Also, the Tartars came out of the mountains in his time, and the duchy of Bohemia became a kingdom, and St William lived in and after his time. I described these things in the account of the deeds of Count Floris the Fat – sometimes I wrote about such events before the counts, following the author Brother Cornelius, who composed his chronicle in divisions and from whom I copy this chronicle. Nevertheless, aided by the years and date, one can always know when things happened.

When Jan included information from chapters on universal history, he preferred to reverse the Divisiekroniek’s organization, in accordance with the modus operandi of his first chronicle, almost always recounting the events in Holland described in a divisie before incorporating those passages concerning ‘extraneous’ matter which he deemed important or interesting enough to include in his own work. He would then move on to the material about the next count contained in the next divisie.

---

857 The first A.D. date in the chronicle is ‘vijer ende veertich jaer na goeds gheboerte’, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 11v; the last date mentioned before that point is AUC 224 (530 BC), ibid., fol. 11r.

858 Ibid., fol. 125r-v, from Divisiekroniek, fol. 214r (div. 25, cap. 1).

859 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 126v, from Divisiekroniek, fol. 214r-v (div. 25, cap. 1).

860 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 51r: ‘Item in den tijden van graeff dirck voerscreuen openbaerde een grote circkel ront om die mane Mede quamen die tartaren in sijnen tijden wt die gheberchten Ende dat hartoehdom van bemen wart een coninckrike, ende sinte willem leefde oec in sijnen tijden ende na sijn tijt Het dwelc jc voer bescreuen ende gheroert hebbe in die ijesten van graeff florijrs die vette het dwelc je tot meer tijden alzoe voer die grauen ghescreuen ende gheteijkent hebbe achter volghende den autoer broderen cornelis daer jc deze cronijck wt make ende hale die sijn cronijck ende boeck in diuisijen ghestelt heeft Nijettemin doer die jaren ende datum mach men altijt weten wanneer die saken gheschijet sijn’.

861 E.g., MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 62r-v, material from Divisiekroniek div. 16, capp. 2, 4, 11, followed (fols 62v-63r) by material from div. 14, cap. 1; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 66v-69r, material from Divisiekroniek, div. 17, capp. 2-15, followed (fol. 69r-v) by material from div. 17, cap. 1.
A further factor accounting for omissions of entire chapters, especially from the early part of the Divisiekroniek, is Jan’s exclusion of historical matter to do with Utrecht. In his first chronicle, as we saw in the previous chapter, he excised much of Beke’s information about Utrecht, occasionally referring to a chronicle of the diocese which he claimed to have written earlier.\textsuperscript{862} In his second chronicle, although he never refers to his work on Utrecht, he carries this policy much further, leaving out an even larger amount of material relating to the diocese.\textsuperscript{863} Any modern student of the history of the Netherlands will be surprised to see the missions of Willibrord, as well as the martyrdom of Boniface, missing from the historical record;\textsuperscript{864} medieval readers would have been equally surprised to see no mention made of the foundation of the very first church at Utrecht.\textsuperscript{865} The small number of passages about Utrecht which Jan preserves in full were probably chosen for the attractiveness of their narrative. This appears to be the case with the episode of Count Ansfried of Teisterbant, later bishop of Utrecht, and his devout wife who was suspected of infidelity, and the miracle which confirmed her innocence;\textsuperscript{866} certainly, the chapter did not attract Jan’s attention because of the details about the count’s gifts to Utrecht, since he completely omits the letter of confirmation.\textsuperscript{867}

In similar fashion, Jan’s second chronicle, when read on its own, differs from previous histories of the county by marginalizing the Frisians to the point of irrelevance; entire chapters about Frisian revolts and attempts to conquer Friesland are omitted or reduced to a single sentence.\textsuperscript{868} It seems reasonable to assume that he felt that it was unnecessary to

\textsuperscript{862} MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 25r, 33v, 36r, 40v, 44r, 56v, 179v, 192r, 249v; cf. above, Chapter 2, pp. 153-154.

\textsuperscript{863} Jan’s omission of chapters mostly or exclusively concerned with Utrecht accounts for the largest number of excluded chapters: Divisiekroniek, div. 2, cap. 19; div. 3, capp. 2-7, 11-14, 17-21, 23-4, 27, 30-36, 74, 81-7, 89, 91, 94-5; div. 4, capp. 16-18; div. 5, capp. 8-12, 14, 15, 19; div. 6, capp. 3, 6, 8-9, 14, 18; div. 10, capp. 4, 12; div. 12, capp. 4, 11, 18, 19, 21; div. 13, capp. 6, 8, 9; div. 14, capp. 5, 8, 9; div. 16, capp. 5, 7, 9; div. 17, capp. 3-9, 11, 12; div. 18, capp. 16, 17, 19; div. 19, capp. 3, 5, 6, 11; div. 20, cap. 3; div. 21, capp. 6, 15, 24; div. 22, capp. 11, 13, 16-18, 28-9; div. 23, capp. 6-8, 13, 15; div. 24, capp. 5, 7, 9, 11, 12; div. 25, capp. 3-6; div. 26, capp. 12, 20, 28-30, 32-3, 37, 40-41, 44, 48; div. 27, cap. 14; div. 28, cap. 22; div. 29, cap. 18.

\textsuperscript{864} Divisiekroniek, fol. 64r (div. 3, cap. 31).

\textsuperscript{865} Ibid., div. 2, cap. 34.

\textsuperscript{866} Ibid., div. 7, cap. 7; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 33v-34r.

\textsuperscript{867} Another example is Divisiekroniek, div. 16, cap. 6, in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 63v-65r, the story of Everwach, the financial secretary of Bishop Dirk van Are. For the historiography of this episode, see J. L. van der Gouw, Everwach, de rentmeester van de bisschop van Utrecht: een verhaal uit het begin van de dertiende eeuw (Hilversum, 1994).

\textsuperscript{868} The chapter in the Divisiekroniek dealing with Dirk II’s battles against the Frisians (div. 5, cap. 4) is abbreviated to a single sentence, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 24v; while references to later counts’ attempts to subdue the Frisians (e.g., fol. 110r [div.6, cap. 1]; fol. 111v [div. 6, cap. 4]; fol. 114v [div. 7,
include such material since the *Divisiekroniek* presented events in much the same way that he had done in his earlier work.\(^{869}\) In any case, it was by no means an attempt on Jan’s part to whitewash the Frisians, who, from the perspective of historians of Holland, had always been presented as particularly nefarious; for he makes his adherence to the *communis opinio* on the Frisians crystal clear. The author of the *Divisiekroniek* had noted that Duke Albert was surprised to see the Frisians rebel again shortly after he had subdued them: ‘he was astonished by the inborn rebelliousness of the Frisians’.\(^{870}\) Jan, in the conclusion to his very heavily abbreviated passage about this rebellion, takes a moment to reflect on the episode and its implications:

After this, the Frisians rebelled a third time. This astonished Duke Albert, and he noted that it was the Frisians’ inborn nature always to rebel and to be unsteady, and to disregard their promises and treaties. His thoughts and observations were accurate and whoever expects anything else from the Frisians will always be deceived in the end; for if you read all the chronicles of Holland, and others, you will find that they never kept faith for long, but are always inclined to dishonesty, and they do not want to be subdued or claimed; they lie and pretend for a while if they cannot do better, but when they see an opportunity, they will turn tail; and if someone takes them under his protection, they will disregard, if they can, any favour he has bestowed on them in the past, when they notice that he wants to exert his authority.\(^{871}\)

Having omitted so many passages about Frisian rebellions and about Holland’s incursions into Friesland, Jan perhaps felt the need to make a statement showing that the Frisians had played a significant – and unswervingly disreputable – role in Holland’s history.

Other omissions can be explained by Jan’s detailed treatment of the same subjects in his first chronicle. For example, the origin of the Franks, and the difference between the cap. 5)) and chapters about the long series of incursions in West Friesland by Counts Willem II and Floris V (div. 18, cap. 26; div. 19, capp. 9, 12, 14) are omitted.

\(^{869}\) Cf., e.g., MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 61r-62r and 67r-70r for the expeditions of Counts Willem II and Floris V.

\(^{870}\) *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 237r (div. 26, cap. 52): ‘Hertoge aelbrecht die verwonderde sere van dese ingheboeren rebelheit der vriesen’.

\(^{871}\) MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 141v-142r: ‘Hijer na rebbeleerden die vriezen derde mael waer van hartoch aelbert zeer verwondert was ende merce wel datte een ingheboeren wezen der vriezen was altijt te rebelleren ende onstantvastich te zijn ende hoer gheloftenisse ende behreuinghe nijet ghedenckende te houwen, ende sijn ghedachten ende anmerkinge waren warachtich ende wijte anders ijet van den vriezen vermoet die sal altijt int eijnde bedroghen wezen want ouerleest alle die cronijcken van hollant ende andere ghij en sult nijet bevinden dat sij oijt lang gheloeff hebben ghehouwen mer sijn altijt tot ontrouwicheijt gheneijcht ende en willen nijet bedwonghen nogh begheert sijn, sij lijen ende veijnssen hem wel een wijl tijts als sij nijet beth en moghen mer als sij hoer open stijen strijcken sij hoer staert, ende wijze in sijn protecci ende bescermenisse neemt ende sij bevinden dat hij der heerschappe int eijnede ouer sal willen hebben ende ghebruijckhen. als sij beter mogen en sullen sij die voerleden weldeaden nijet ghedencken’.
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Franks and the French, which had been a central issue and a growing concern in the historical tradition of Holland, and which Jan had dealt with extensively in his first chronicle, was rehearsed in the Divisiekroniek largely along the same lines and therefore was entirely left out in Jan’s second chronicle.

A small number of omissions seem more deliberate, however – above all, those passages containing information about Holland that was not already covered in Jan’s first chronicle. His decision to leave out such passages can perhaps reveal something about his interests. For instance, he seems to have cared little for foundation myths about cities, which are a characteristic feature of the Divisiekroniek, and which had not been dealt with in Jan’s first chronicle. These omissions may reflect the attitude of a son of nobility to a tendency in recent historiography which was, no doubt, particularly appealing to urban audiences.

Conversely, he retained some material which was not strictly about Holland, but touched on matters further afield. The rise of the different principalities in the region (all combined in his own day in the hands of the Habsburg rulers) were apparently of interest to him, since he included the Divisiekroniek’s accounts of the foundation of the duchy of Guelders, the counties of the Mark (Altena) and Berg, and of the county of Flanders. The author of the Divisiekroniek explained the reason for including such episodes in a history of Holland, an argument which had remained implicit in Jan’s first chronicle but which he took over verbatim in the second:

From now on, I will be silent about this county of Flanders; it is enough that we know the way in which it became a county. But later you will hear how, through succession, it eventually was transferred by marriage to the house of Burgundy, namely to Duke

---

872 Above, Chapter 1, pp. 52-53, 65, 67.
873 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 23r-24r. See above Chapter 2, pp. 94.
874 Divisiekroniek, div. 2, cap. 22; the author himself presents it as only marginally relevant to the history of Holland, concluding (fol. 46r): ‘Nu wil ic weder keren op mijn voer genomen materie.’
875 Jan omits Divisiekroniek, div. 2, capp. 25 (Leiden), 26 (Haarlem); cf. Tilmans, Historiography, pp. 203-7, who identifies this story as one of a developing arsenal for the expression of growing patriotism among late medieval historians in Holland; I believe they are, instead, a sign of the growing urbanization and particularism of the intended readership of historical texts. See Groenveld, “‘Natie’”.
876 See also above, Chapter 1, p. 65; Chapter 2, p. 110, n. 479.
877 Divisiekroniek, div. 4, cap. 3; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 21r-22r.
878 Divisiekroniek, div. 11, cap. 2; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 44v-45v.
879 Divisiekroniek, div. 4, cap. 2; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 17v-21r.
Philip the Bold, and so forth to the noble Archduke Charles of Austria and of Burgundy, etc., Count of Flanders, of Holland, Zealand, etc.\textsuperscript{880}

Other matter with no obvious link to Holland seems to have been included by Jan merely for its inherent narrative interest. In spite of his general lack of interest in legendary origin stories, Jan took over from the \textit{Divisiekroniek} a lengthy account, ultimately based on Geoffrey of Monmouth, of the advent of Hengest and Horsa to Britain – told on account of an identification of the Saxons with the Frisians –,\textsuperscript{881} including the famous meeting of Vortigern and Renwein (the ‘Wassail / Drink hail’ episode) and the Night of the Long Knives on Salisbury Plain (the ultimate betrayal of the Britons at the hands of the English, initiated with the secret battle cry ‘Nimet oure saxas!’).\textsuperscript{882}

Often such episodes which were included because they coincided with Jan’s interests as we know them from his first chronicle were self-contained \textit{exempla} – for instance, the story of Bishop Hatto of Mentz, who in order to alleviate a famine murdered a large group of poor people, ‘whom he thought of as mice eating grain’ and who through divine retribution was himself eventually devoured by mice.\textsuperscript{883} Occasionally, he explicated the moral of such stories more explicitly than the author of the \textit{Divisiekroniek}: in recounting the death by drowning of a particularly nasty ‘tyrant’, who had made a pact with the devil, Jan adds: ‘in that way he was deceived by his master whom he had served for a long time’.\textsuperscript{884}

As in his first chronicle, Jan enthusiastically embraces tales about curiosities and wonders. The story of the giant Klaas van Kieten took place in Holland,\textsuperscript{885} as did that of

\textsuperscript{880} \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fol. 89v-90r (div. 4, cap. 2): ‘van desen graefscappe van vlaenderen willen wi nu voert swigen het is ons genoech dat wi weten hoe ende in wat manieren dattet een graefscap geworden is mer hier na suldi horen hoe dattet bi successien van tiden gecomen ende behylicht is anden huse der edelre hertogen van burgongen als an hertoge phills le hardi ende s ovoert an den edele aershertoge kaerle van oestenrijc van burgondien etcetera graue van vlaenderen van hollant zeelant etcetera’. MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 20v-21r. The account of the duchy of Guelders concludes with its succession to the house of Burgundy, \textit{Divisiekroniek} fol. 90v (div. 4, cap. 3); MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 22r.

\textsuperscript{881} \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fol. 46r (div. 2, cap. 14): ‘Hoe dat die vriesen ofte nedersassen dat conincrie van brittangen becrachtigden ende wonnen’; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 12r.

\textsuperscript{882} MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 12r-15v.

\textsuperscript{883} Ibid., fol. 37r: ‘die hij achte als muzen die dat koern eten’; \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fol. 123r (div. 9, cap. 1). Another example is the brief account of a group of more than 200 dancers who drowned after the Roman Bridge of Maastricht collapsed because they had failed to pay the Holy Sacrament which was carried nearby proper respect: MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 78r, from \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fol. 175r (div. 19, cap. 1).

\textsuperscript{884} MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 87v-88r (added to the account from \textit{Divisiekroniek}, fol. 194r [div. 21, cap. 21]): ‘ende jndeser manieren wart hij van sijn meester bedroghen die hij langhe tijt hadde ghedijent’.

\textsuperscript{885} MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 82r-v, from \textit{Divisiekroniek}, div. 20, cap. 14.
the sea woman who appeared after a flooding of the Zuyder Zee, so these events would justify inclusion on that account; but this was certainly not the case for the sea bishop who was discovered in the kingdom of Poland.

It is hardly surprising that Jan chose to incorporate the story of a heresy – one of his hobby horses – which arose in the Stedingen region of Bremen. The participation of the Count of Holland in the ensuing crusade may have been the ostensible reason for including the passage, but the narrative was perhaps sufficiently good to earn a place in his chronicle. An account of the dancing epidemic which gripped Cologne, Aachen, Maastricht and Liege in 1374 was certainly attractive enough to be included on its own merits. For a section on the First Crusade, which had no connection to Holland but clearly fell within Jan’s parameters of significant information, he rearranged the material dispersed in various chapters of the *Divisiekroniek* in order to concentrate the information in a single consecutive narrative. An extensive account of the failed suppression of the Hussite rebellion in Bohemia, which obviously fell within Jan’s ambit, was included in full. But there may have been another reason as well: whereas the author of the *Divisiekroniek* blamed the fiasco squarely on division in the Church, Jan also attributed the expedition’s failure to ‘the Christian princes, for if they had not wanted to subdivide the kingdom of Bohemia because of their avarice ... they would have easily destroyed the strayed sheep and heretics’.

Jan’s version of the argument was directed not only against partisan division but also, and perhaps more importantly, against the expropriation by minor princes of territories belonging to the emperor, who also claimed

---

886 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 180v-181r, from *Divisiekroniek*, div. 26, cap. 57.
889 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 147r-148r, from *Divisiekroniek*, div. 26, cap. 24.
890 See, e.g., above, Chapter 2, pp. 99, 111, 114, 124-126.
891 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 43r-44v, from *Divisiekroniek*, div. 10, cap. 2 and div. 11, cap. 2.
892 See, e.g., above, Chapter 2, pp. 88, 99, 108.
893 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 197v-199v, from *Divisiekroniek*, div. 27, cap. 22.
894 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol 199v (added to *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 254r [div. 27, cap. 22]): ‘Want en hadden die kersten princhen doer hoer ghiericheijt nijet willen deijlen het conincrijk van bemen ... sij souden die verdwaelde scapen ende ketters wel lichtelicken vernijelt hebben’. 
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the title of King of Bohemia – a claim which was advanced by Maximilian I of Habsburg.895

It is less easy to explain why Jan took over chapters such as the one on the history and illustrious alumni of the diocese of Liège and of its cathedral of St Lambert,896 though it may have been because control of Liège had been an objective of the counts of Holland from Jan of Bavaria (bishop of Liège before he became count of Holland) onwards, and because the history of the diocese had often been part of chronicles of Holland.897 Although he avoided foundation stories of religious houses in the beginning of his chronicle, Jan later included accounts of the founding of the Carthusian and Cistercian Orders.898 The latter case can perhaps be explained by his affinity with the abbey of Loosduinen, which was a Cistercian foundation;899 but he appears to have developed a more general interest in the orders which gave shape to such a large part of late medieval religiosity, also taking over from the Divisiekroniek the history of the dissolution and re-foundation of the Order of the Holy Cross and of the foundation of the orders of the Jacobins (Dominicans), the Friars Minor (Franciscans), the Brothers of Our Lady (Carmelites), the Teutonic Knights and the White Monks (Premonstratensians).900

Trying to determine why Jan chose to excerpt some passages and omit others is often a matter of guesswork. Nevertheless, certain tendencies are clear, and these confirm what we have learnt about his interests from his first chronicle. For example, the account of the Tartars in the Divisiekroniek was far more concise than the one in Jan’s first chronicle and contained no new information; but his fascination with this people no doubt explains its inclusion in full.901 Why, however, he also took over the remainder of this chapter, which contained material on universal history – the order of the Hermits of St William,

895 See above, Chapter 2, p. 109.
896 Divisiekroniek, div. 10, cap. 8; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 41v-43r
897 Cf. Beke, Croniken, pp. 285-9 (§16); MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 205v-207r.
898 Divisiekroniek, div. 10, cap. 1; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 39v-40r.
899 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 51r.
900 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 65r-66r, from Divisiekroniek, fols 155r-156r (div. 16, cap. 1).
901 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 47v, from Divisiekroniek, fol. 137r (div. 12, cap. 1); cf. MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 67v, 79r-85r, from Antoninus Florentinus, Opus excellentissimum hystoriarum seu cronicarum (Leiden, 1512), III, fols 48r-53v (xix.viii.prologue-xvii), 82v (xx.viii.viii-ix), excerpted and rearranged; see above, Chapter 2, pp. 105-106, 108.
the *translatio* of the Three Magi and the Seven Machabee Brothers – is less apparent.\(^{902}\) The very brief account of the Third Crusade in this same chapter of the *Divisiekroniek* should, in principle, have been omitted since Jan dealt with it in his first chronicle;\(^{903}\) but, like the Tartars, it was included.\(^{904}\)

### Additions from Other Sources

Confirming his interest in crusader narratives, Jan concluded this episode with a long narrative taken from a second, as yet unidentified, source.\(^{905}\) One of only a handful of passages not taken from the *Divisiekroniek*,\(^ {906}\) it is hardly enough to justify his claim in the introduction to have added ‘many matters and beautiful histories taken from various books and authors, documents and letters’ to his main source;\(^{907}\) but it is nonetheless significant. His additions this time around are not nearly as extensive or dramatic as those found in his first chronicle, but they underline some of the conclusions we have formulated about Jan’s areas of interest.

In contrast to his previous practice, in the second chronicle Jan usually did not indicate the source for the information he took from works other than the *Divisiekroniek*. In doing so, he may have modelled himself on the *Divisiekroniek*, in which sources were referred to only sparingly. Of the sixteen works mentioned in the prologue to the *Divisiekroniek*, at least seven had previously been used by Jan;\(^ {908}\) and he may also have realized that he shared a common source with the *Divisiekroniek* in the ‘Most Excellent Chronicle of Brabant’.\(^ {909}\) It is possible that Jan was struck by this overlap between the sources of his own first chronicle and those of the *Divisiekroniek*; and, given his belief that the latter

---

\(^{902}\) MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 48r, from *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 137v (div. 12, cap. 1). Elsewhere, Jan includes the *translatio* of Mary Magdalen: MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 78r, from *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 175r (div. 19, cap. 1).

\(^{903}\) *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 137v (div. 12, cap. 1); cf. MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 36v-37v, from Beke, *Croniken*, pp. 87-8 (cap. 55) and Antoninus Florentinus, *Opus*, II, fols 236r-237r (xvii.ix.xiv, xvii.ix.xix).

\(^{904}\) MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 53v-57r, from *Divisiekroniek*, div. 13, capp. 10-13.

\(^{905}\) MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 57r-61r.

\(^{906}\) See below, pp. 205-207.

\(^{907}\) MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 1v: ‘Mede sijn daer in ghetoghen veel materijen ende scone historijen wt verscheijen boecken ende autoeren wten latijnen ende wten duijtschen’.

\(^{908}\) *Divisiekroniek*, fol. b.v: Gaguin, Vincent of Beauvais, Antoninus of Florence (erroneously ‘Anthonis’, but later in the text, fol. 155r [div. 16, cap.1], ‘Antoninus’), *Fasciculus temporum, Supplementum chronicalarum* (erroneously attributed to ‘Berthelmeeus’, but later in the text, fol. 4r [div. 1, cap. 4]: ‘Jacobus Philippi’), Jan Beke and possibly Hartmann Schedel, if Jan was aware of the authorship of his ‘grote cronijck met die figuren’.

\(^{909}\) See above, p. 169 and n. 741.
work had benefited from privileged access to a source unavailable to him, it is perhaps no coincidence that most of the material he added to the second chronicle came from Froissart’s *Chroniques*, which the author of the *Divisiekroniek*, who did not know French, 910 had been unable to consult.

Nevertheless, he took much less from Froissart this time around than he had done in his first chronicle; 911 only two long passages are translated from the *Chroniques*. The first recounts wars between the Scots and the English, as well as between the English and the French; but, as he had already included in his first chronicle those passages which referred to the deeds of the counts of Holland and their family members, the links to his main narrative were now much more spurious or even non-existent. 912 The second is a composite of various episodes, some containing political history, 913 others entertaining tales. 914 In keeping with Jan’s keen interest in rebellion and heresy, as well as his penchant for exciting narrative, the final part of this passage incorporates Froissart’s complete account of the Peasants’ Revolt of 1381 in England. 915 While making only the smallest of omissions, he inserts one significant addition, illustrating his fondness for exemplary narrative. Froissart explained how the rebellious peasants had purchased uniforms, but had not paid their bill:

With that, a tailor named John Tickle came, who had brought 40 doublets with which some of these brigands were dressed, who said to the tiler: ‘Sir, who will satisfy me for my doublets? I’m owed as much as 30 marks.’ ‘Be content,’ Wat said, ‘you will be paid today still. Rely on me, I will be enough of a security for you.’ 916

---

911 See above, Chapter 2, pp. 95-99.
912 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 97v-99r, from Jean Froissart, *Chroniques de France*, 4 vols (Paris, 1513), I, fols 18r-19v (followed by passages from I, fols 21v, 26v, 24v-25r, abbreviated and mixed with information from the *Divisiekroniek*); fols 101r-104v, from I, fols 46v-52r (omitting the material already included in Jan’s first chronicle, e.g., the siege of Tournay, I, fols 52r-55v); 104v-118r, from I, fols 56r-91r (occasionally abbreviated); Jan adds, at fol. 108r, to I, fol. 65r (‘le comte de cornouaille’): ‘cornuaelgen (dat in coninck artus tijden een conincrijck plach te sijn’) (my emphasis).
913 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 145v-147r, from Froissart, *Chroniques*, I, fols 165v-171v; fols 148r-156r, from II, fols 240r-270r (abbreviated, with information inserted from III, fols 8v-20v); fols 167v-173v, from III, fols 158r-187r (abbreviated); fols 173v-174v, from IV, fols 13v-14r; fols 176v-179v, from IV, fols 35r-105r (excerpted and abbreviated).
914 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 157v-160v, from Froissart, *Chroniques*, II, fols 226v-228v.
915 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 160v-167r, from Froissart, *Chroniques*, II, fols 80r-86v.
916 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 165r, from Froissart, *Chroniques*, II, fol. 85r: ‘Mettijen quam daer een wambis maker ghenoemt johan ticle die met hem ghebracht hadde xl wambezen daer deze scuijmers eens deels mede ghecleet waren, deze seijde tot den tegheldecker Heer wijte sal mijn vernoeghen van mijn wambezen mijn ontbrect wel xxx markt Sijt te vreden seijde wouter ghij sult noch van daech wel betaelt warden hout v an mijn ghij hebt mans ghenoech’.
The bill, however, remained unpaid, and the leaders of the revolt were captured and killed:

Jack Straw and John Ball were found hiding in a derelict house, and thought they could hide forever and escape; but they could not, because they were brought down and captured by their own people. The king and his men were very pleased by capturing them, and they were decapitated, as was the dead body of the tiler.917

Jan then adds his own aside, making explicit the implicit irony in Froissart’s account:

‘After his death, who would give the tailor his money, which he had guaranteed?’918

While the sentence may have come from Jan’s exemplar, it surely is in character. This amateur historian, who felt free to add an exemplary episode to the story of King Donkey’s Ears and who inserted accounts from his own experience into the history of Holland – possibly inspired by Froissart himself – would, no doubt, have felt a certain satisfaction that he was able to improve on Froissart’s narrative skills.

In the light of his compilatory practice in the first chronicle, it is surprising that, apart from the Froissart material, only a small handful of paragraphs in the second chronicle present information which does not come directly from the Divisiekroniek – and even some of these may have been cobbled together by Jan, combining his own historical knowledge with a paraphrase from the Divisiekroniek.919 One or two provide personal commentary.920 In spite of his reticence on the matter in this instance, Jan’s reliance on further sources cannot, however, be entirely discounted:921 at least one minor addition unquestionably derives from Gaguin’s Compendium.922
The Naaldwijk Family

Jan’s second chronicle has much less of a personal touch than his first one. One notable exception is Jan’s treatment of his own family. As in his first chronicle, which had contained a memorial to his ancestry and praise for his more fortunate relations, the second one also emphasized, where possible, the role played by the Naaldwijk family in the history of Holland, occasionally making it seem a little more prominent than it was portrayed in his source. So, for example, he located his ancestor Boudewijn van Naaldwijk in a list in the Divisiekroniek of noblemen living in Holland during the time of Count Jan II – a feature copied from its principal source, the chronicle of Johannes a Leydis. Boudewijn’s position, however, almost at the end of the list of knights, just preceding the unknighted noblemen, clearly did not please Jan, who moved the name to higher up on the list, placing him in the company of great aristocrats such as the lords of Heemskerk, Raaphorst and Poelgeest.

In his first chronicle, Jan had presented the full list of noblemen who had died together with Count Willem IV at the Battle of Warns against the Frisians. In the second one, he preserved only the name of Willem I van Naaldwijk from the version of the list found in the Divisiekroniek, adding that he was ‘the builder and founder of the chapter house of Naaldwijk’, the foundation of this chapter house had already been described in his first chronicle. In another passage, he made a small alteration to underline the deep historical roots and importance of the Naaldwijk family: his illustrious ancestor Willem II van Naaldwijk is referred to in the Divisiekroniek as maerscalc, ‘marshal’ of Holland; Jan changes this to effmaerscalck, ‘hereditary marshal’, emphasizing the dynastic nature of the honorific title, which had been held by the Naaldwijk family since the early thirteenth century and was the sole surviving honorary hereditary title in Holland.

923 See above, Chapter 2, pp. 151-153.
924 See above, Chapter 1, p. 65.
925 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 87r, from Divisiekroniek, fol. 194v (div. 21, cap. 23).
926 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 149v.
927 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 97r, adapted from Divisiekroniek, fol. 208v (div. 23, cap. 14).
928 MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 107v.
929 Divisiekroniek fol. 226v (div. 26, cap. 21) as ‘maerscale’ of Holland, which Jan (MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 137r) changes to ‘effmaerscalck’; and again, fol. 145v, from Divisiekroniek, fol. 231v (div. 26, cap. 39).
930 Other members of the family also preferred to include the hereditary prefix of the title, though it tends to be omitted in documents: A. Janse, Ridderschap in Holland: portret van een adellijke elite in de late middeleeuwen (Hilversum, 2001), pp. 356-7. It was still used by members of the Naaldwijk family in the second half of the sixteenth century: Arnoldus Buchelius, Inscriptiones monumentaque in templis et
Finally, as he had done in his previous chronicle, Jan once again paid special attention to his cousin Barbara. A chapter on the genealogy of the counts of Gennep in the Divisiekroniek concludes with Walraven van Brederode: ‘This Sir Walraven was first married to the daughter van der Vere; later he married the daughter of the count of Neuenahr in the diocese of Cologne.’ Jan inserted a long passage between the two marriages of Sir Walraven about his progeny from his first wife:

This Sir Walraven was first married to the daughter van der Vere, with whom he had two sons and two daughters, the oldest of whom was married to Sir Johan, lord of Montfoort, with whom she had children; this lord of Montfoort was first married to the only daughter of Sir Hendrik van Naaldwijk, hereditary marshal of Holland, lord of Capelle, etc. With her, he had two daughters, the oldest of whom, who was called Mechelteld, married squire Robert, the second son of Arenberg, lord of Naaldwijk, Loenhout, Buchout, Capelle, castellan of Brussels, etc. And the second daughter, named Barbara, married Sir Maximiliaan van Horne, lord of Gaasbeek, of Braine-le-Château, castellan of Bergues-St-Winnoc, etc., and both women have children from their husbands.

One immediately striking feature of this genealogical passage is that it traces several female, rather than the customary male, lines. It might seem, at first glance, that this addition was inspired by Jan’s desire to connect his own family to the prestigious genealogy of the counts of Gennep and the Brederode family (prominent Hoeken). We know, however, from the first chronicle that Jan felt gratitude towards his cousin Barbara; and it is obvious that it was her appearance in this genealogy which induced him to include it. Reflecting the difference in tone between the first and second chronicles, however, Jan now presents the information on Barbara dispassionately, with no personal comment. Although his predilections clearly still influenced the inclusion,

---

monasteriis Belgicis inventa: Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 4 L 16 (cat. 1648), p. 84 (http://www.hetutrechtsarchief.nl/collectie/handschriften/buchelius/inscriptiones).

931 See above, Chapter 2, p. 152.

932 Divisiekroniek, fol. 228v (div. 26 cap. 26): ‘Dese here walrauen hadde eerst te wiue des heren dochter vander vere. daer na nam hi te wiue des grauen dochter uan nyenraer wten stichte van coelen’.

933 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 137v: ‘Deze heer walrauen hadde eerst te wijff des heren dochter van der vere daer hij bij hadt ij sonen ende ij dochteren daer die outste van is ghehilict an heren johan heer van montfoert daer siij kinderen bij heeft welke heer van montfoert eerst ghehilict was an die enighe dochter van heren heijnr of naeldwick erffmaerscalck van hollant heer ter capellen etcetera Daer hij bij creech ij dochteren, daer die outste off mechtelt ghenoomt te man heeft joncker robbert anderde zoen van arenberch heer van naeldwick van loenhout buchout ter capellen burchgraeff van bruzel etcetera Ende die ij dochter barbara ghenoomt is ghehilict an heren maximiliaan van hoorn heer van gaesbeek van breijn casteel burchgraeff van sinte wijnants berch etcetera ende alle beij die vrouwen hebben kinderen bij hoer manen Deze heer walrauen heer van bredenroede nam na te wijff des grauen dochter van nijenraer wten stichte van koelen daer hij ock kinderen bij crijcht’.

934 See above, Chapter 2, p. 152.
exclusion and alteration of material, he was reluctant to articulate them in the second chronicle, perhaps not wishing to express such personal sentiments in what he purported to be a summary of the Divisiekroniek.

Hoeken and Kabeljauwen
Where we can, nonetheless, hear Jan’s own voice, if somewhat mutedly, is in those passages which he took over from the Divisiekroniek concerning the partisan disputes between the Hoeken and Kabeljauwen – a central issue in the late medieval history of Holland and a sore point for Jan personally. The author of the Divisiekroniek took a deliberately neutral stance in his descriptions of such disputes, aiming at an objective, unpartisan history. For Jan, as far as we can deduce from his practice, such striving for impartiality in history writing was misguided: he seems to have been more concerned to lay out the rights and the wrongs properly than to strike a pose of evenhandedness. Clearly, these disputes between Hoeken and Kabeljauwen mattered to him personally. At one point he asks God to

\[
\text{take pity on the souls who senselessly lost their lives because of this cursed partisanship (parthij), and who for no reason or fault of their own lost all they had, and who have been condemned because of it, and their heads and other limbs dishonourably placed on gates and towers.}
\]

The term partij, which I have translated as ‘partisanship’, is also used by Jan to mean ‘party’; and its appearance here in the singular suggests that he considered only one of the two parties guilty of causing the injuries which resulted from these disputes. When he took it on himself to select relevant material from the Divisiekroniek to supplement his own chronicle of Holland, he also set out to correct its version of events. He never explicitly announced this aim as part of his project; and at no point did he indicate that he

---

935 See above, Chapter 2, pp. 135-137.
936 Cf. Divisiekroniek, fol. 429r (div. 32, cap. 36): ‘Want waert saecke dat wi dye gesten ende feyten simplicken ende naectlicken souden scriuen nader waerheit also si geschiet sijn sonder twifel wi souden vanden sommigen die noch leuen grote indignacie ende onwaerdicheit verweruen ende gecrigen.’ Nevertheless, the impartiality of the Divisiekroniek may have been overstated and deserves further investigation.
937 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 124r: ‘hij moet der zijelen ontfermen die doer deze vermaledide parthij hoer lijff onnozelicken verloren hebben ende sonder zaeck ende verdijenste thoor quijt zijn ghewarden ende daerom gherecht zijn gheweest ende hoer hoefden zeer scandelicken ende andere leden op poerten ende toernen wt ghesteken warden’.
938 Verwijs and Verdam, Middelnederlandsch woordenboek, s.v. ‘Partie’, shows that singular use with the meaning ‘partisanship’ is rare, providing only one example (‘muterie ende partie’).
had altered the narrative of the *Divisiekroniek* or even that he disagreed with it. Yet, in his representation of the historical episodes around which these disputes revolved, he consistently rewrote the text of the *Divisiekroniek*, so that the party of the Hoeken, to which his family belonged, appeared in a more favourable light. It must be said, however, that this is the only subject on which Jan is consistently at odds with the *Divisiekroniek*.

The differences between the two accounts are obvious from the outset. As we have seen, the disputed succession after the death of Willem IV had caused the initial rift between the Hoeken, the supporters of Margaret, and the Kabeljauwen, who pledged their support to her son Willem V. Starting with the first mention of Margaret, as one of the children of Count Willem III, Jan made small alterations to the text of the *Divisiekroniek* to stress the legitimacy of her claims to sovereignty over the county, changing the neutral description of her as ‘Margaret, Empress of Rome, wife of Emperor Louis of Bavaria’, to ‘Roman Empress Margaret, who later became Lady of Holland’.

Further on, the *Divisiekroniek* reported a clear account of the circumstances surrounding her assumption of power:

Louis, Duke of Bavaria, emperor of Rome, hearing that his brother-in-law Willem of Holland and Friesland had been killed by the Frisians, wore his imperial ornaments and sat in judgement, and requested a ruling from his princes and lords. They unanimously determined that the lordship and county of Holland, Zealand and Friesland had become vacant, bequeathed and reverted to the Roman Empire because Count Willem of Hainault, Holland, Zealand and Friesland had died without leaving behind any children. Emperor Louis, on account of his imperial majesty and kindness, then gave these fiefdoms to Lady Margaret, his married wife and sister of the aforementioned Willem.

In this account, it is explicitly the emperor who decided the succession, based on his imperial authority and his benevolence towards his wife. The family relationship between

---

939 See above, Chapter 2, pp. 135-137.


941 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 89r: ‘Margrijet keijserinne van romen die na vrou van hollant wart’.

942 *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 209r-v (div. 24, cap. 1): ‘lodewijck hertoge van beyeren keyser van romen verhorende dat zijn swagher graue willem van hollant ende vrieslant vanden vriesen verslagen was heeft bi hem gestelt in keiserlicher ornamenten ende is te recht geseten ende heeft vonnesse ende ordel van sine princeen ende heren versocht die welke allegader seiden ende determineerden als die heerluchte ende graefscappe van hollant zeelant ende vrieslant ghelheal ende al vaceerde bestoruen ende gecomen waer an den roemscchen rike want graue willem van henegouwen van hollant zeelant ende vrieslant gestoruen waer sonder enige kinderen after te laten Die welcke heerluchten dye keyser lodewijck ouermits sine keiserlickie maiesteyt. ende miltheit op die tijt gaf vrouwe margriete sine geechte huysrouwe des voerseyde graue willems suster’.
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Margaret and the deceased count is treated as relevant, but not in any way decisive. Jan presents the succession of the county to Margaret in very different terms:

Margaret, Empress of Rome, wife of Emperor Louis, had inherited the lands of Hainault, Holland, Zealand and Friesland on account of her brother, Count Willem, and these lands had also been given and allotted to her by her husband the emperor, when they had been assigned to him by his princes and lords, because the aforementioned Count Willem had died without leaving behind any children.943

Here the succession is treated as a matter of natural order: Margaret inherited the titles of her deceased brother as his next of kin, and the imperial act was one of confirmation, not of donation. In Jan’s version, the legitimacy of Margaret’s claim is unquestionable; in the Divisiekroniek, it remains dependent on the authority of the emperor’s command. Later on in the Divisiekroniek, it is stated that she ‘entrusted the counties of Holland, Zealand and the lordship of Friesland’ to her son Willem van Oostervant, leaving the potential ambiguity of where true sovereignty over the county lay, with the empress or her son, unresolved. Jan changed the wording in order to make it clear that she had appointed Willem as ‘regent’,944 the caretaker of her sovereignty.

When the author of the Divisiekroniek tells how the ailing Willem VI of Holland, duke of Bavaria, had his subjects pledge that they would accept his daughter Jacoba (Jacqueline) as their ruler after his death – she would be supported by the Hoeken in the ensuing succession dispute – Jan adds: ‘but several of them kept the oath poorly and dishonestly, as will become clear later on’.945 It would indeed become apparent, but only in Jan’s account, not in the Divisiekroniek, in which the troubles during Jacoba’s reign are blamed on both sides in the dispute: ‘the two parties arose once again’.946 In his rewriting

943 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 122v: ‘MArgrijet die keijserinne van romen keijser lodewijcks huijsvrou ... die landen van henegouwen hollant zeeleant ende vrieslan ...'

944 Divisiekroniek, fol. 209v (div. 24, cap. 2): ‘dye keyserinne ... heeft met goeder deliberacie ende rade willem haren outsten sone palatijn ende graue van oestervant, ouer gegeuen ende beuolen die graefscappen van hollant zeeleant ende heerlicht van vrieslant te regieren’; MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 123r-v: ‘Dije keijserinne ... heeft ... hoeren outsten zoen willem graeff van oestervant ghemaect ruwaert ende regijerder van hollant zeeleant ende vrieslant’.

945 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 185v, adds to Divisiekroniek, fol. 252v (div. 27, cap. 19b): ‘Mer twart nochtans zeer qualicken ende valschelicken van den sommighen onderhouwen als na blijken sal’.

946 Divisiekroniek, fol. 256r (div. 28, cap. 2): ‘si en was mer xvi. iae out als si haer heerlichen ende vaderlijcke erue an nam, god betert si en mochtese mit rust ende vrede niet gebruyken, want dye ij parthyen bestonden weder in Hollandt op te staen, die van der hoeceans partye waren hildent mit vrouwe iacob haren rechten lantsvrouwe ende die cabbeliaus partye waren haer altijt contrarie waer omme dat si alle die dagen
of the episode, Jan absolves the Hoeken of any responsibility, stating that ‘the party of the Kabeljauwen once again reared its head’. He then writes:

for a long time, on account of the devout duke of Bavaria, they had been suppressed and expelled due to their rebelliousness and crimes. Remembering their grief, they decided to avenge it on their rightful lady, whom they always opposed, and invited whatever foreign lord they could find to drive their lady apart from her people, and to drive out and injure the party of the Hoeken, who supported their rightful lady. Because of this, she spent all the days of her life in great tribulation and sorrow, and her supporters did as well, as you will hear later on.\(^\text{947}\)

Countless more examples could be cited of Jan’s manipulation of the Divisiekroniek to present a story which is consistently more favourable to the Hoeken and more critical of the Kabeljauwen. The significance of actions of the Kabeljauwen is belittled,\(^\text{948}\) and their justice questioned.\(^\text{949}\) The motivations behind their actions are queried,\(^\text{950}\) or painted more darkly than in the Divisiekroniek,\(^\text{951}\) while those of the Hoeken are placed in a more

---

\(^{947}\) MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 200v-201r: ‘Sij en was mer xvi jaer out als sij hoer heerlicheden ende vaderlicke erff an nam, god betert sij en mochtze met vreden ende ruste nijet ghebruijcken Want die cabbeliaus partije begonen hoer oren weder op te steken die langhe tijt met reden van den vromen hartoghe van beijeren verdruct ende veriaecht waren gheweest doer hoer rebellheijt ende mesdaet ende hoers leets ghedenckende wouden sij dat op hoer gherechte lantsvrouwe wreken ende waren hoer altoijt contrari ende en gauender nijet om wat vreemt heer ende andere sij in haelden op dat sij hoer vrou van den hoeren vervreemden mochten ende die hoeks partij te verdriuen ende ghewelt an te doen dijet met hoer gherechte lantsvrouw hijelden Waerom dat sij alle die daghen hoers leuens in groter tribulacijen ende verdriet ouerbrachte ende oock dije ghene dijet met hoer hijelden als ghij na hoeren sult’ (my emphasis).

\(^{948}\) E.g., a long description in Divisiekroniek, div. 28, capp. 7-8, of events surrounding the capture of Dordrecht is summarized in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 204v-205r: ‘Ende hartoch jan van brabant heeft met sijn hulperen nijet lang daer na die stede van dordrecht beleghen mer onlancks daer na schijet hij metten sijnen scandelicken van daen achterlatende sommige van den zijnen doot int velt legghen sonder ijet bedreuen te hebben dat waerdich is om te vertellen’ (my emphasis). Jan had given a very negative picture of Duke Jan in his first chronicle (MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 227r-v, addition to Beke, Croniken, p. 319 [§33]), but had given a full account of the events at Dordrecht (MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 224r and 227v-228v, from Beke, Croniken, pp. 312 and 319-21 [§29, 33]).

\(^{949}\) E.g., MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 207r, ‘Ende als deze heer phillips houen gheloeff recht ende reden van zijn burchgraefscap gherogeert ende beroeft was wart hij oock ten laetsten veriaecht ende verdreuen’, with addition (my emphasis), from Divisiekroniek, fol. 262r (div. 28, cap. 13).

\(^{950}\) E.g., about certain nobility who had been chased out of Holland by the Kabeljauwen (Divisiekroniek, fol. 261r [div. 28, cap. 12]), Jan adds ‘sonder reden’ (MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 205v).

\(^{951}\) E.g., Divisiekroniek, fol. 256r (div. 28, cap. 3), neutrally tells: ‘Als hertoge willem ofliuich geworden was, doe worden si al verblijt dat van hem verdruct ende verdriet waren waerom dat here willem van egmont van ysselstein ende here ian van egmont zijn broeder ouerleiden hoe si best souden recupereren ende weder crigen haer vaderlike eer der si vt verdreuen waren bi tiden hertoge willems van beijeren.’ MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 201r, instead reads: ‘Ende wijte dat verblijt was of drueuich van den doot hoers heren heer villem van egmont ende van ysselstein ende hoer ian van egmont zijn broeder waren zeer verhoecht ende verblijt van hoers heren doot ende dochten twas tijt om weder na ysselstein ende hoer goeden te staen’. Elsewhere, Jan has another dig at the Arkel family: MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 144v, addition to Divisiekroniek, div. 26, cap. 56. Cf. above, n. 920.
positive light. The claims of the Hoeken are presented as factual statements rather than contentious assertions, and criticism of their character is softened. Finally, in describing the events which for the time being ended open hostilities – the transition of the county of Holland to the house of Burgundy as a result of the peace between Philip the Good and Jacoba of Bavaria in 1428, which in practice meant the defeat of Jacoba – Jan’s changes served to defend Jacoba’s claims to the county and to condemn the betrayal perpetrated by the people who had promised her father to accept her as their countess: ‘in no time the cities of the party of the Kabeljauwen had denied their rightful lady and heir’.

The Unfinished End

Towards the end of the second chronicle, Jan increasingly reproduces the full text of the Divisiekroniek, omitting fewer chapters and, from the ascendancy of Philip the Good onwards, making fewer alterations. This is the period for which the Divisiekroniek had most new material to offer, since Jan’s copy of the ‘Dutch Beke’ ran out at this point, and he had not been very successful in finding material on later events. The Divisiekroniek, in this regard, was of great assistance: so, for example, where Jan’s account of the reign of Philip the Good in the first chronicle had covered eighteen pages,

---

952 E.g., MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 213v, copied from Divisiekroniek, div. 28, cap. 28, but omitting its suggestion of impropriety on the account of Jacoba (fol. 269r: ‘waer om si auijs ende raet gehadt heeft mit haren secreten vrienden hoe si in enyger manieren enige sloten of steden in hollant in souden criegen ... ’)

953 E.g., MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 218v, describing Jacoba, adding to Divisiekroniek, fol. 272v (div. 28, cap. 39): ‘daer sij onder hoerden te sijn’.

954 E.g., Willem van Lalain, stadholder for Philip the Good, and a champion of the Hoeken, is described in Divisiekroniek, fol. 290v (div. 29, cap. 11): ‘ende hoe wel dese here willem van laleyn dat stedehouderscap qualiken hadde geregeert ende misbruyct nochtans soe regeerde ende bestijerde hi dat vele schentliker ende parthijeliker dese meester goeswijn die wilde president als ghij na hoeren sult’ (my emphasis). Jan rewrites, and softens the criticism fol. 249r: ‘ende hoe wel dezen heren willem van laleijn dat stedehouwerscap niet al te wel gheregijert en hadde nochtans soe regijerde ende bestijerde hij dat voel schentliker ende parthijeliker deze meester goeswijn die wilde president als ghij na hoeren sult’ (my emphasis). See for Lalaing the enjoyable account in W. Bilderdijk, Geschiedenis des vaderlands, IV, ed. H. W. Tydeman (Amsterdam, 1833), pp. 148-51.

955 MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 214r: ‘Metten cortsten die steden van der cabbeliaus parthijen hebben hoeren gherechten gheboeren vrou ontsieijt’; cf. Divisiekroniek, fol. 270v (div. 28, cap. 31).

956 Starting from MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 219r, taken from Divisiekroniek, div. 28 cap. 11. The period before this, which covered the partisan disputes, was the subject of intensive editorial activity on Jan’s part, as noted above, pp. 210-955.

he was able to provide almost four times as much in the second chronicle, totalling seventy pages, all copied directly from the *Divisiekroniek* with a minimum of changes.\footnote{The reign of Philip as count of Holland is dealt with in MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 260v-269r; in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, it is on fols 233v-267r, all taken from *Divisiekroniek* div. 29, capp. 2-35, almost unchanged and with very few chapters omitted, i.e., only div. 29, capp.18 (war between Utrecht and Münster), 19 (Ottoman conquest of Constantinople), 29 (the dauphin visits Philip), 32-3 (Philip aids the dauphin Louis; Henry VI of England captured, Edward of York king). The manuscripts ends in the middle of the first sentence of cap. 35. According to the summary of contents of this part of the chronicle, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 233v, div. 29, capp. 3 and 16 were planned for inclusion.}

Finally, his manuscript breaks off mid-sentence, near the end of a recto page – ruling out the possibility that any text has been lost at the end of the manuscript.\footnote{MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 267r: ‘In dit selue jaer van lxi wart kaerle graeff van’. Emanuel van Meteren adds, erroneously, ‘Hollant’. The sentence should read, following *Divisiekroniek*, fol. 301r (div. 29, cap. 35): ‘In dit selue iaer van lxi. wert kaerle graef van charloys here van bethunen castrebelijn arckel, putten ende stryen, ende van goylant gehult ....’.} By this stage in his appropriation of the *Divisiekroniek*, Jan had stopped altering details in the text of his source and he was far less engaged in the task of selecting the most significant passages, an endeavour which he had taken very seriously earlier on in the chronicle. Perhaps he had begun to tire of the project; or perhaps correcting the portrayal of the early disputes between the Hoeken and Kabeljauwen in the *Divisiekroniek* had really been his principal aim. In any event, he stopped writing quite suddenly: not only the text, but also the table of contents, which he had apparently updated regularly while composing the chronicle, ends mid-sentence: ‘About a war of the Hollanders against’.\footnote{MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fol. 7v, ‘Van een oerloch van den hollanders tegen’, referring to the war against the Waterlanders (cf. summary, fol. 233v), described on fols 252v-253r. The unfinished state of the table of contents rules out the possibility that there was a second volume, now lost.} It was not his death which prevented him from completing the manuscript,\footnote{As Hertog, *Abdij*, p. 442, speculated. The date he proposes for Jan’s death (c. 1520, p. 439) is presumably based on this speculation.} since he died only in 1540,\footnote{For Jan van Naaldwijk’s death, see C. Hoek, ‘Repertorium op de lenen van de Hofstad te Hontshol, 1253-1770’, *Ons Voorgeslacht* 27 (1972), pp. 149-304, nr. 20 (The Hague, Nationaal Archief, Archief van de Nassause Domeinraad, inv. Hingman, nr. 6524 and 6525), ‘1527: Jan van Naeldwijck tocht zijn vrouw jonkvrouwe Alijt van Bloemendael aan 50 gulden per jaar.’; ‘23-9-1540: Adriaen van Naeldwijck bij dode van zijn vader Jan van Naeldwijk en tocht zijn vrouw jonkvrouwe Alijt van Bloemendael aan 50 gulden per jaar.’ Cf. W. van Gouthoeven, *D’oude chronijcke ende historien van Holland*, 2 vols (Dordrecht, 1620), I, p. 194, for Jan’s marriage to Geertruid van Haeften and Adriaan as his heir.} while most of his chronicle was written by 1524 at the latest.\footnote{See above, n. 743.} The manuscript found its way to his descendants, and through them eventually into the British Library, where it still carries a note of ownership which he himself inscribed on a cover which held the quires together: ‘This book belongs to Jan van Naaldwijk.’\footnote{MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, paper slip, in the hand of the author, pasted on front leaf: ‘Dit boeck hoert toe Jan van naaldwijk’.
Chapter 4

‘Veel fabuleuse dingen’

‘Many fabrications’
– Medieval Chronicles in the Early Modern Period

Fig. 26: Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 6 D 9 (cat. 1185), fol. 95v: Jan van Naaldwijk in the genealogy of his family in the adelskronieken

Image taken with kind permission of the staff of the Rare Book Room at the Universiteitsbibliotheek, Utrecht.
EMANUEL VAN METEREN AS A READER OF JAN VAN NAALDWIJK’S CHRONICLES OF HOLLAND

Before the manuscripts of Jan van Naaldwijk’s chronicles of Holland entered the collections of Sir Robert Cotton in the early seventeenth century, where they were to stay virtually unnoticed until the second half of the eighteenth century, they were read from beginning to end by their last Dutch-speaking owner, Emanuel van Meteren, who was an historian himself. Van Meteren made several notes in the margins which give brief indications of the subject matter, in all probability as an aide-mémoire for later consultation, making it easier to find and identify episodes of particular interest. Each of these annotations are in Dutch, except for a small set in Jan’s second chronicle, drawing attention to the Peasants’ Revolt of 1382; on this occasion, alone, van Meteren’s notes are in English. Did his mind, on reading the specifically English material Jan had added to the history of Holland, inadvertently slip from his and Jan’s mother tongue into the language of his new homeland? Or was he perhaps planning to show these passages to one of his English friends with historical interests – for example, Robert Cotton or William Camden – just as he might have shared those annotated in Dutch with his contacts in the Netherlands, such as the humanist historians Janus Dousa the Elder and Younger or the antiquarian historian Pieter Corneliszoon Bockenberg? As we shall see later on in this chapter, humanist and antiquarian historians alike shared an interest in the medieval history of the county of Holland.

---

965 I have not been able to establish whether the manuscripts came into the possession of Cotton before or after the death of van Meteren in 1612. See above, pp. 13-15 (‘Introduction’), for the provenance of the manuscripts.


967 London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 8v, 65v, 71v, 89r, 93v, 91r, 149r, 151r, 152r, 156v, 195v, 196v, 197r, 199r, 257r, 329r, 329v, 331r, 363r, 363v, 367r, 371r; London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C iv, fols 57r, 64r, 101v, 160v, 165v, 166r, 266v.


969 A good picture of van Meteren’s circle of acquaintances is provided by his album amicorum: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 68, ed. H. C. Rogge, ‘Het album van Emanuel van Meteren’, Oud Holland 15 (1897), pp. 159-92. See W. D. Verduy, Emanual van Meteren, bijdrage tot de kennis van zijn leven, zijn tijd en het ontstaan van zijn geschiedwerk (The Hague, 1926), pp. 231-5, for an index. For letters by van Meteren to Sir Robert Cotton see, e.g., British Library, MS Cotton Julius C iii, fols 138r-142r.
Van Meteren does not appear to have consulted Jan’s chronicles for his own work on the Dutch Revolt and its origins, in which his treatment of the history of the Burgundian Netherlands is very brief, only beginning in earnest from the time of the marriage of Mary of Burgundy and Maximilian of Habsburg in 1477.\footnote{Meteren, \textit{Historie}, fol. 5r.} It may be significant that 1477 was also the year that the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, in its printed incarnation, concluded, as did many other late medieval chronicles of the Dutch Low Countries.\footnote{\textit{‘Chronicle of Gouda’}: \textit{Die cronike of die hystorie van Hollant van Zeelant ende Vrieslant ende van den sticht van Utrecht} (Gouda, 1478). Other chronicles ending in 1477 include the chronicles of Brabant and Flanders in Jan Veldener, \textit{Dat boec dat men hiet Fasciculus temporum} (Utrecht, 1480), fols 232r-243v, 275r-282v; also concluding in 1477/78 are, e.g., \textit{Narrative Sources from the Medieval Low Countries}, http://www.narrative-sources.be/, nos NL0179, NL0180, NL0217, NL0294, NL0401 and NL0420.} It is not clear which of these factors was decisive for van Meteren; but it is worth noting that several historians of the sixteenth century began their chronicles where the printed ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ left off.\footnote{E.g., the anonymous chronicle of Amsterdam, 1477-1534, in The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 76 H 42, as noted by a later reader on its flyleaf: ‘deese Hollandse Amsterdamse chronijck kan dienen tot een vervolg op ‘t Goudse chronijckje (van P. Scrivierius uitgegeeven,) welke eyndigt met de doot van Carolus Burgundus voor Nancij, anno 1477’. Other examples are \textit{Narrative Sources} nos B016, G098 and H042; finally, the marriage of Mary and Maximilian is the starting-point for the printed chronicle bound together with Jan’s second chronicle in MS Cotton Tiberius C iv: \textit{Dit sijn die wonderlijke oorloghen van den doorluchtighen hooghgeboren Prince, Keyser Maximiliaen} (Antwerp, [c. 1531]).} This date, which formed an obvious end-point for chroniclers writing in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, became an equally obvious starting-point for later historians, whose works, despite passing over the region’s history in the Middle Ages, remained directly connected to the late medieval historical tradition, forming, so to speak, the second half of an historiographical diptych.

This is far from the only way in which early modern historical writing in Holland retained ties to the medieval historical tradition. And although Jan seems not to have written his chronicles with publication in mind, and although they exerted little or no influence, even on van Meteren, the one later historian who certainly read them, I have nevertheless tried to show in this dissertation that they have something to teach us about developments in Dutch history writing during the early sixteenth century. In proper humanist fashion, van Meteren distanced himself from medieval historical writing, complaining that, especially for the period between the early Middle Ages and the time of the Burgundians, there was little reliable information, ‘but many fabrications’.\footnote{Meteren, \textit{Historie}, fol. 1v: ‘maer wel veel fabuleuse dingen.’} Nonetheless, the chronicle tradition of the Middle Ages did not entirely disappear from view. Indeed, to some extent, the historiographical experiments of the early modern period can be seen as attempts at continuing and renewing medieval history writing about
Holland. It is therefore worth taking a fresh look at how the chronicle tradition fared in subsequent years.
Fig. 27: Chronyke van de geschiedenissen in Holland, Zeeland, en Vriesland, en van de bisschoppen van Utrecht, op nieuws overgezien en van fouten verbeterd (Amsterdam, 1802); Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, KK 05-136

Image taken with kind permission of the staff of the Rare Book Room at the Universiteitsbibliotheek, Amsterdam.
Fig. 28: *Kronijcxken van alle de gedenkwaerdigste geschiedenissen*, bound with *Nieuwe alkmaarder Almanach ... 1749* (Alkmaar, n.d.);
Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Mini 514

Fig. 29: G. J. Zaagman, *Kort en bondigh chronijcxken*, bound with *Almanach na de nieuwe en oude stijl ... 1674* (Amsterdam, n.d.);
Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Mini 455

Images taken with kind permission of the staff of the Rare Book Room at the Universiteitsbibliotheek, Amsterdam.
Fig. 30: *Historien ende waerachtighe gheschiedenissen van alle het ghedenckweerdichste datter gheschiedt is ’tzedert den jare 1400* (Amsterdam, n.d.)

Image from The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek (http://www.kb.nl).

Fig. 31: *Historien ende waerachtighe gheschiedenissen van alle het ghedenckweerdichste datter gheschiedt is ’tzedert den jare 1400* (Amsterdam, n.d.), sig. b6r; The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 26 F 12

Image taken with kind permission of the staff of the Rare Book Room at the Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague.
MEDIEVAL CHRONICLES AND THE POPULAR PRINTING PRESS

It has been suggested, in an article about Dutch historiography from 1350 to 1530, that after the late fifteenth century, the word ‘chronicle’ disappeared from the vocabulary of historians, apart from the authors of city and town chronicles; and, within this context, Jan van Naaldwijk has been singled out as an exception.974 The observation may well be true for the years up to 1530; but the term ‘chronicle’ came back into use in 1538, with the publication, in Antwerp, of Dye cronijcke van Hollant Zeelant ende Vrieslant van alle geschiedenissen int corte (‘The Chronicle of Holland, Zeeland and Utrecht, of All Histories in Brief’). This short work consisted primarily of brief excerpts from the Divisiekronek,975 relating little more about the medieval history of the county than what had been taken over from Johannes a Leydis and, therefore, firmly rooted in the historical tradition based on Jan Beke. In subsequent editions, the narrative was soon extended to cover the period up to 1540, and a brief survey of the Reformation was added in the seventeenth century.976 Printed at least 25 times before the end of the century, and another 28 times over the following two centuries,977 it was issued for the last time in 1802 (Fig. 27).978

In 1637, an ‘improved’ edition was prepared. The corrections do not appear to have altered the text in any significant way, except for a further strengthening of the focus on regional affairs – the material in the Divisiekronek on universal history, which had already been largely set aside by the original compiler of the short chronicle, was now omitted in its entirety.979 The revision and reprinting of this chronicle attests to a persistent interest in the medieval history of the region throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It shows that such interest was not limited to the more specialist readership of (as a rule, more lavishly produced) historical editions and


978 Chronyke van de geschiedenissen in Holland, Zeeland, en Vriesland, en van de bisschoppen van Utrecht, op nieuws overgezein en van fouten verbeterd (Amsterdam, 1802).

works by antiquaries and humanist scholars. Its exclusive focus on Holland apparently did not bother readers, although it is found at least once bound together with a chronicle of Brabant, which would have provided a somewhat more comprehensive picture of the medieval history of the Dutch Low Countries.

In the late eighteenth century, *Dye cronijcke van Hollant Zeelant ende Vrieslant van alle geschiedenissen int corte* appeared in a version divided up into several volumes. Since the text of the chronicle is virtually unaltered, it should be regarded as a previously unidentified reprint. A unique copy of this printing has been preserved, though it contains only the third volume of what was originally a multi-volume edition, covering the period from Count Dirk II to 1186. The small volume is bound together with thirteen other texts, beginning with an almanac of Utrecht for the year 1790, and finishing with a chronicle of the years 1713 to 1789. The collection is thus representative of a continuous, but previously unnoticed, tradition of combined almanacs and chronicles, extending from the late sixteenth century to the modern era.

Almanacs were among the most popular, and most enduring, products of the popularization of the printing press. Short annalistic chronicles are found opposite the calendar for the same years in larger sized almanacs, or printed together with almanacs. Most commonly, however, they were published in a format suitable for binding with almanacs. As such, they were frequently bound with items such as

---

980 Use in schools is suggested by an added introduction, see *Chronyke* (1802), p. 2. See also Hulshof, ‘Middeleeuwsch kronieke’, pp. 330-31, for its use as a school text.
981 See the copy of *Dye chronijck van Hollant, Zeelant ende Vrieslandt ... toten jare 1543* (Antwerp, 1548): The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliothek, shelfmark 1702 G 7 [1].
982 *Cronykje van de geschiedenissen in Holland, Gelderland, Zeeland, Vriesland en Utrecht. III. stuk* (Utrecht, n.d.). It is a 16° booklet, consisting of one quire gathering of eight pages, measuring 9 x 7 cm.
983 See the copy of *Den nieuwen Utrechtschen almanach op’t jaar onses heeren Jesu Christi, 1790* (Utrecht, 1790): Leiden, Universiteitsbibliothek, shelfmark 1160 H 28.
984 *Korte kronyk beginnende van den jare 1713* (n.p., n.d.).
986 E.g., *Comptoir almanach op ’t schrikkel jaar onses Heeren Jesu Christi MDCC XXXII* (Amsterdam, n.d.), containing an annalistic chronicle of Europe, with special reference to the Dutch Republic, from 1680 to 1731.
987 E.g., [J. van Vliet], *Bredaesche almanac en chroniick* (Breda, [1663]), sig. c1r: ‘Bredaesche chroniick’.
988 These have quire signatures starting a1r and form independent typographical units. Information about the almanac chronicles can be found in the descriptive bibliography in the CD-ROM issued with Salman, *Populair drukwerk*, which surveys all almanacs published in the northern Netherlands between 1570 and 1705; see, e.g., consecutive versions of the chronicle bound with Gillis Joosten Zaagman’s almanacs for 1665, 1667, 1674, 1679, 1685, 1698, 1700.
prognostications and local shipping timetables, as well as collections of anecdotes, jokes or proverbs. Individual parts were occasionally distributed independently from the almanacs of their original publisher.\footnote{Salman, Populair drukwerk, p. 235.}

Almanacs bound together with separately published chronicles were generally small in format (Fig. 28), and sometimes tiny (Fig. 29).\footnote{Most are in 16° format of around 9 x 7 cm, but a smaller one survives in Kort en bondigh chronijcxken, van alle de gedenkwaerdigste geschiedenissen voorgevallen tsedert de geboorte onses Heeren Jesu Christi tot dit tegenwoordige jaer (Amsterdam, n.d.), found with Kleyne Zaagmans almanach op 't jaer 1674 (Amsterdam, n.d.), a 32° of about 7 x 4.5 cm (Fig. 29).}

Some chronicles spanned the entire Middle Ages to the date of printing,\footnote{Kronijcxken van alle de gedenkwaerdigste geschiedenissen zedert de geboorte Onzes Heeren Jesu Christi, tot deze tegenwoordiggen jare toe. Dag voornamelyk 't geene in de Nederlanden is voorgevallen, zedert 1500 (Alkmaar, n.d.), is bound with Nieuwe Alkmaarder almanach, op het iaar ... 1749 (Alkmaar, n.d.): Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, shelfmark Mini 514; Vliet, Bredaesche almanac, which contains an annalistic chronicle from 422 to 1647.} others covered the years from 1400 onwards (Fig. 30),\footnote{Historien ende waerachtighe gheschiedenisse van alle die ghedenckweerdichste dingen die geschiet zijn tsedert den jare 1500 tot desen teghenwoordighen jaere 1590 (Amsterdam, 1590).} from 1500 onwards,\footnote{Kort kronykxken beginnende van den jare 1600 (n.p., n.d.), bound with Schrijf-almanach na den nieuwen-stijl op 't iaer ons Heeren 1702 (Haarlem, n.d.): Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, shelfmark OK 63-6703.} from 1600 onwards,\footnote{Kort kronyczken beginnende van den jare 1650 (n.p., n.d.), a chronicle of world events running originally from 1700 to 1721 and later extended, in phases, to 1755.} from 1650 onwards,\footnote{Cf., e.g., Korte kronyk beginnende van den jaare 1711 (n.p., n.d.), in d’Erven Stigt, Leydse almanach, op't schrickel-iaar ... 1756 (Leiden, n.d.): Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, shelfmark 1029 F 62 (d’Erven Stigt Leydse almanach op't iaer ... 1757 [Leiden, n.d.]); the chronicle is copied word for word, but the deletion of items in the early years (e.g., 12 August and 31 September, 1714; 19 Augustus, 1717), has created enough space to continue the chronicle at the end, to 29 June 1756, instead of 21 April 1755.} or from 1700 onwards.\footnote{Kort kronycxken beginnende van den jare 1700 (n.p., n.d.), a chronicle of world events running originally from 1700 to 1721 and later extended, in phases, to 1755.}

They were continuously revised by their printers in order to supply customers with a reasonably up-to-date account, along with the new almanac for the year. Printers aimed to make the text of each chronicle fit exactly into one quire – or sometimes two; consequently, in successive versions, entries in the beginning of the chronicle were often scrapped or abbreviated to make space for new ones at the end.\footnote{The nature of the contents remained more or less stable throughout the seventeenth century – a combination, also found in countless medieval chronicles, of political history, disasters...}
(earthquakes, fires) and miraculous events, such as the marvellous birth of quadruplets in 1601 (Fig. 31).

Chronicles of this type were not invariably appended to almanacs, but also circulated independently; and some Sammelbänder contain several such works, so that together they deal with a longer period than the individual chronicles. Some of these chronicles concern regions other than the Dutch Low Countries or Holland itself; and many, especially the later ones, cover only a small number of years or deal with specific events. Several, while running from the birth of Christ to the year of printing, include very little medieval history, though the little they do contain could usually have been lifted straight from medieval chronicles of Holland. This can be seen in the set of annals from the tiny chronicle bound with Zaagman’s almanac in 1674 (Fig. 29):

993. Dirk became the first count of Holland, Zeeland, and lord of Friesland.
997. Willem, bishop of Mainz, locked up many poor people in a shed and let them burn; but afterwards he was chased by rats and mice, and eaten.
1273. The countess of Hennenberg delivered 365 children from a single pregnancy; she lies buried in Loosduinen in Holland.
1274. The Haarlemers won Damietta.

---

998 The chronicle in Vliet, Bredaesche almanac (see above, n. 991) was also issued separately as [J. van Vliet], Bredaesche chronick (Breda, [1663]).
999 E.g., Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, shelfmark OK 62-8871 (1-3) contains, bound together with a rhymed chronicle of the medieval history of the region of Zaandam in Noord-Holland, Beschryvinghe van Ovt Zaanden ([Allkmaar, 1640]), one chronicle from 1500 to 1590, Cronica dat is waerachtige historien, as well as a consecutive one from 1600 to 1656, Chronyxken der voornaemste nederlantsche gheschiedenissen, soo kerckelijck als politijcq, tzedert den jare 1600 ... gecontinueert tot het iaer 1656 (Amsterdam, n.d.); G. Brandt, Kort verhael van de reformatie (Amsterdam, 1658), a short chronicle of the Netherlands from 1555 to 1600, is followed, by its publisher, with the Onpartijdigh chronyxken der voornaemste nederlantsche gheschiedenissen ... tsedert den jare 1600 ... den vierden druc ... tot op het iaer 1658 (Amsterdam, 1658), which is a slightly different version from the Chronyxken der voornaemste nederlantsche gheschiedenissen in Amsterdam, Universiteitbibliotheek, shelfmark OK 62-8871.
1000 E.g., Groote oprechte comptoir almanach, schrickel-iaer nae de nieuwe en oude-stijl, op ’t iaer nae de geboorte ons Heeren Jesu Christi 1672 (Amsterdam, n.d.), sig. a1v: ‘Chronyck der koningen van Vranckrijck, en harer voornaemst bedrijven, sedert den Iare Christi 419 tot den Iare 1672’.
1001 E.g., Groote oprechte comptoir almanach nae de nieuwe en oude-stijl op ’t iaer nae de geboorte onses Heeren Jesu Christi 1673 (Amsterdam, n.d.), sig. A1v: ‘Chronyckje van de voornaemste daden en overwinninge der hoogberoemde Princen van Oranje’; Zaagmans almanach na de nieuen en ouden-stijl op ’t schrickel-iaer onses Heeren Jesu Christi MDCLXXVI (Amsterdam, 1676), sig. d4r: ‘Kort memoriael van wat er gepasseert is in den jare 1672, 73, 74, en 75, in de Nederlandt Provintien’.
1002 [G. J. Zaagman], Kort en bondigh chronicken, van alle de gedenckwaerdighste gheschiedenissen, voor gevallen tsedert de geboorte onses heeren Jesu Christi, tot dit tegenwoordige jaer ([Amsterdam, 1673]) sig. a2r-v: ‘1993. Is Diederick gheworden eerste Graef van Hollandt, Zeelandt, ende Heere van Vrieslandt / 997. Heeft Willem Bisschop van Ments, veel arme Lieden in een Schuer gesloten en verbranden laten, doch is naderhant van de Ratten en Muysen vervolght en op gegeten. / 1273. Baerde de Gravin van Hennenbergh t’ eener dracht 365 Kinderen, zy leyt tot Loosduynen in Hollandt begraven. / 1274. Wonnen de Haerlemmers Damieten.’ The chronicle runs to 1673 and is bound with Almanach na de nieuwe en oude stijl ... 1674 (Amsterdam, n.d.): Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, shelfmark Mini 455. The information is found,
A different version of the same chronicle, which can be found bound with an almanac for Alkmaar more than half a century later, adds, directly before and after the entry about Damietta:

1371. In Holland there were the Hoeken and Kabeljauwen.
1374. The Haarlemers won Damietta.
1397. The great Tamerlane lived.
1403. At Edam, a mermaid was caught.\footnote{Kronijcxken van alle de gedenkwaerdigste geschiedenissen, sig. a2r: ‘1371 Was ‘t in Holland Hoeks en Cabeljaeuws / 1374 Winnen de Haerlemmers Damiaten / 1397 Leefde den Grooten Tamerlaan. / 1403 Is by Edam een Meermin gevangen.’ An account of the mermaid of Edam can be found in the Divisiekroniek, fol. 239r-v (div. 26, cap. 57).}

Another short chronicle shares many entries with the two mentioned above – the reference to Dirk I, for example, and the outbreak of the partisan disputes in Holland;\footnote{Kort en bondig werelts-kronijck, waer in gedacht is al het principaelste gepasseerde, ‘t sedert het beginsel der werelt, tot desen tegenwoordigen tijd, alles naukeurigh by een gestelt: voorsien met verschiede schoone figuren (Amsterdam, [1695]), bound with Stichters borger wacht-almanach voor ‘t jaer ons Heeren 1695 (Amsterdam, n.d.): Amsterdam, Universiteitsbibliotheek, shelfmark Mini 707, fols 7v-8r.} but it omits several, such as the countess of Hennenberg, while adding others, such as: ‘1422. In Zealand there was a giantess’.\footnote{Ibid., fol. 8r: ‘1422. Was in Zeelandt een Reusinne’.

1005 More significantly, the information about Holland is now embedded within a world chronicle beginning with the birth of Christ.\footnote{1006 The conclusion is lost; the text as it stands ends in 1597, but a catchword on the last verso shows that the original continued from 1606 onwards on the next page.} It is merely coincidental, of course, that the information about Tamerlane included in the second of these chronicles mirrors material added to the medieval tradition by Jan van Naaldwijk and that the provision of a universal historical framework in the third chronicle parallels what the author of the Divisiekroniek did with the history of Holland;\footnote{1007 See above, Chapter 2, pp. 108, 110; Chapter 3, pp. 163-164.} the carelessness with which these chronicles were compiled is immediately apparent.\footnote{1008 See, e.g., above, n. 1002; also, the disagreement about the date of the supposed capture of Damietta by the Haarlemers – in 1274 in the first chronicle, and 1374 in the second – is surely due to typographical sloppiness.} Nevertheless, the differences between these three chronicles show that, as well as continually updating these works, publishers also made recurrent efforts to tweak their contents.\footnote{e.g., in the Divisiekroniek, folks 111v and 114v, 123r, 178r-v and 147v; confusion over the dates is likely to be due to a careless misreading of intermediary sources.}
Although variations between these three chronicles betray little about their authors, the genre was not insensitive to the political and religious polemics which pervaded much of the literature of the period; and sometimes even minute differences between such chronicles enable us to get a glimpse of ideological battles being fought. For example, a chronicle entitled *Corte beschrijvinge vande notabelste geschiedenissen* (‘Short Description of the Most Notable Histories’) and covering the period from 1500 to 1590, the year in which it was first published, has an explicitly Protestant character, as is apparent from the satisfaction with which the author adds to the annalistic entries it shared with other chronicles the notice that in 1519: ‘Erasmus wrote very amicably to Luther from Leuven, praising the sharpness of his mind, which revealed a Christian heart.’\footnote{Cronica dat is waerachtige historien, sig. b1r: ‘T’selue iaer schrijft Erasmus Roterodamo van Loeuen, den Luther seer vrientlick, ende prijst die scherpheyt zijns verstants, dat hy een Christelick her openbaert.’} Although the letter in question is certainly sympathetic to Luther as a person, in it Erasmus, in fact, carefully distances himself from the Reformer’s writings and the controversies arising from them.\footnote{Erasmus, *Opus epistolarum*, ed. P. S. Allen et al., 12 vols (Oxford, 1906-58), III, pp. 605-7 (ep. 980).} Similar chronicles merely mentioned the year of Erasmus’s death.\footnote{E.g., *Corte beschrijvinge vande notabelste geschiedenissen*, zedert den iare M.D. tot den iare 1615. cronijcx wyse by een vergadert (The Hague, 1615), found with *Almanach, voor’t jaer onses Heeren, M DC XV* (The Hague, n.d.): Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, shelfmark 1499 G 30, sig a2v: ‘Tselve jaer [i.e., 1536] sterf Erasmus van Rotterdam.’}

Between 1519 and 1520, the annalistic coverage of the *Corte beschrijvinge* is disrupted by the following entry: ‘In the year 1415, on the 8\textsuperscript{th} of July, the devout and pious John Hus was burned at the Council of Constance, because he supported the truth of the Holy Gospel.’\footnote{Cronica dat is waerachtige historien, sig. b1r: ‘Anno 1415. den 8. Julij wert den vromen ende Godtzalighen Johannes Hus verbrant, int Concilium van constantz, om dat hy die waerheyt des H. Euangeliums voor stont.’} As we saw, Jan van Naaldwijk’s retelling of a closely related episode from the Council of Constance in his first chronicle of Holland, finished in 1514, predating Luther, and so could not have been inspired by the Reformation.\footnote{See above, Chapter 2, pp. 119-122.} By 1590, however, when the *Corte beschrijvinge* was written, the Reformation had made a profound impression on the Netherlands, and the Dutch Revolt had followed in its wake. The report about Hus’s burning in 1415 may have been inserted for the year 1520 because it was around this time that the Hussites became part of the Reformation debate: they were mentioned in Luther’s *Open Letter to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation*.
and in the first papal bull condemning his errors, \textit{Exsurge, Domine}, both issued that year.\footnote{Martin Luther, ‘An den christlichen Adel deutscher Nation von des christlichen Standes Besserung’, ed. in his \textit{Werke: kritische Gesammtausgabe} 6 (Weimar, 1888), pp. 381-469; Pope Leo X, \textit{Bulla contra errores Martini Lutheri sequacium} (Rome, 1520).}

Such brief chronicles were still being produced in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; but the time span covered became shorter and shorter over time, eventually providing only a description of the political events of the last few years. So, even though a work such as the \textit{Kronijk van 1867-1868} (‘Chronicle of 1867-1868’) found in an almanac for 1869,\footnote{‘Kronijk van 1867-1868’ found in \textit{Nieuwe Utrechtsche almanak voor het jaar 1869} (Utrecht, 1869).} with its quirky combination of local and international information – a dismissal of a professor of the Deventer Athenaeum is mentioned next to a proclamation by the grand duke of Luxembourg – may remind us of Jan’s chronicles, it has little to do with the medieval chronicle tradition. Nevertheless, transitional forms, focusing more and more exclusively on recent events, on the one hand, and on types of information other than historico-political – for example economic and academic – on the other, were issued throughout the eighteenth century.\footnote{E.g., \textit{Korte kronyk beginnende van den jaare 1711} (n.p., n.d.), bound with d’Erven Stigt, \textit{Leydse almanach ... 1756}: Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, shelfmark 1029 F 62.} Occasionally, these were still bound together with more complete chronicles for earlier periods.\footnote{E.g., both \textit{Vervolg van het Kort Kronykje van Holland, enz.} (n.p., n.d.) and a chronicle of 1713-1789 are bound with \textit{Den nieuwen Utrechtschen almanach ... 1790}: Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, shelfmark 1160 H 28.} Moreover, they retained the annalistic form, with very brief entries for each year, though becoming more detailed and expansive as they approached the present time. As for almanacs, they never lost their historical dimension – the current \textit{Enkhuizer almanak}, now in its 415th year, still contains a short chronological account of the past fifteen years concerning politics, the economy, deaths of prominent artists, natural disasters and the royal family.\footnote{\textit{De vanouds vermaarde Erve C. Stichter’s Enkhuizer almanak voor het jaar 2010} (Enkhuizen, [2009]), pp. 230-85: ‘Kroniek beginnende met het jaar 1993’.}

The regional chronicle was not the only type of late medieval chronicle which had a continuing presence in later centuries. New monastic chronicles, as well as continuations of older ones, were still being written in the sixteenth century.\footnote{E.g., the chronicle of Henrica van Erp, see E. O. G. Haitsma Mulier and G. A. C. van der Lem (eds), \textit{Repertorium van geschiedschrijvers in Nederland} 1500-1800 (The Hague, 1990), p. 133 (no. 159); the chronicle of the St Agatha monastery at Amersfoort, see \textit{Narrative Sources}, no. NL0168. See E. M. C. van}
early modern period were city or town chronicles, which regularly included annalistic accounts of medieval history,\textsuperscript{1020} often fancifully grounded in the late medieval chronicle tradition, particularly on the *Divisiekroniek*.\textsuperscript{1021} Historical works concerned with regions of the Low Countries other than Holland also had a vibrant life, both in manuscript and in print. Some of these can be seen, at least in part, as sixteenth-century by-products of the medieval chronicle tradition of Holland and Utrecht.\textsuperscript{1022}

---


\textsuperscript{1021} Thus, e.g., A. Pars, *Catti aborigines Batavorum. Dat is: de Katten de voorouders der Batavieren* (Leiden, 1697). Another source of material were the so-called *adelskronieken*, to be discussed below, pp. 233-235; e.g., A. Kemp, *Leven der doorluchtige heeren van Arkel, ende jaar-beschrijving der stad Gorinchem* (Gorinchem, 1656), was ultimately based on one of the *adelskronieken* about Arkel, with additional material.

\textsuperscript{1022} See, e.g., E. H. Waterbolk, *Twee eeuwen Friese geschiedschrijving. Opkomst, bloei en verval van de Friese historiografie in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw* (Groningen and Djakarta, 1952) for Friesland; P. J. Meertens, *Letterkundig leven in Zeeland in de zestiende en de eerste helft der zeventiende eeuw* (Amsterdam, 1943), pp. 51-3, 443-7, for Zeeland.
Fig. 32: Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 6 D 9 (cat. 1185), fol. 2r: Dutch *adelskronieken*, second half of the sixteenth century

Image from Medieval Manuscripts in Dutch Collections (http://www.mmdc.nl/).
Fig. 33: Alkmaar, Regionaal Archief, Inventaris stadsarchief Alkmaar 1254-1815, no. 2005-2006, no. 4: copy of a rentbrief, early seventeenth century

Image taken with kind permission of the staff of the Regionaal Archief Alkmaar.
ADELSKRONIEKEN

Chronicles of noble families, known as adelskronieken, represent another genre of late medieval historiography which continued to be actively disseminated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.\textsuperscript{1023} Several such short chronicles and genealogies had been composed in the late fifteenth century.\textsuperscript{1024} Some were merely brief genealogies, but those concerning four important families (Teysterband, Arkel, Egmond and Brederode) included more extensive historical information. A series of adelskronieken in Latin appeared in the late fifteenth century,\textsuperscript{1025} and a parallel series in Dutch emerged in the second quarter of the sixteenth, using the Divisiekroniek as one of its sources. Both the Latin and Dutch series were frequently copied in manuscript throughout the sixteenth century, though the order and the selections varied considerably.\textsuperscript{1026}

Among the adelskronieken is a brief genealogy of the Naaldwijk family. It is found in several manuscripts in different degrees of completeness; perhaps surprisingly, it is more informative than Jan’s own account of his family’s history.\textsuperscript{1027} The material in the manuscript adelskronieken, however, stops with Jan himself, who is mentioned, but whose details remain incomplete, with spaces left blank for the later addition of further

\textsuperscript{1023}See A. Janse, Ridderschap in Holland: portret van een adellijke elite in de late middeleeuwen (Hilversum, 2001), pp. 275-89; T. Porck, ‘Een Rijnlandse serie adelskronieken (1533-1542). Het zogenaamde “Voorste Haagsche Handschrift”, Millennium. Tijdschrift voor middeleeuwse studies 1 (2006), pp. 44-62; J. Romein, Geschiedenis van de Noord-Nederlandse geschiedschrijving in de middeleeuwen: bijdrage tot de beschavingsgeschiedenis (Haarlem, 1932), pp. 212-29; Narrative Sources has: NL0259 (the Latin series), NL0260 (the Dutch series), and individually transmitted adelskronieken: Arkel (NL0261, NL0262), Brederode (NL0263, NL0264), Culemborg (NL0265, NL0266, NL0267), Egmond (NL0268, NL0269, NL0270, NL0271, NL0272), Teisterbant (NL0273, NL0274) and Vianen (NL0275, NL0276, NL0277). L. Genicot, Les généalogies, Typologie des sources du moyen âge ocidental, 15 (Turnhout, 1975), p. 21, says that genealogies of lesser nobility became more common in the French Low Countries in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and, ibid., pp. 23-4, points to the transformation of genealogies into brief chronicles in the thirteenth century in Flanders, Brabant and Bavaria. These developments seem, therefore, to have come relatively late to the northern Low Countries.


\textsuperscript{1025}Their relation to the works of Dirk Frankenszoon Pauw (Theodericus Pauli) and Johannes a Leydis is uncertain; see Romein, Geschiedenis, p. 212; W. F. Andriessen, Historia dominorum de Teysterband, Arckel, Egmonda, Brederoede, IJsselsteyn, etc. (Purmerend, 1933).


\textsuperscript{1027}Unlike MS Cotton Vitellius F xv, fols 149v-150r, e.g., The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 131 G 31, fols 75r-76r and Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 6 D 9 (cat. 1185), fols 94v-96r (Fig. 32), include Boudewijn van Naaldwijk, castellan of Wijdenes; he was the father of Willem van Naaldwijk, with whom Jan starts his genealogy. These manuscripts also add, among other details, the daughters of Hendrik van Naaldwijk and Heze van Schalkwijk and a daughter of Willem van Naaldwijk and Sophie van Teylingen. Cf. above, Chapter 2, pp. 151-153.
names (Fig. 26): ‘Adriaan, Willem’s third son, married young lady Dirk’s van Haeften, with whom he had a son called Jan, who was married to .’ The missing details were filled in when information from the *adelskronieken* was used by Wouter Gouthoeven in his expanded edition of the *Divisiekroniek* (1620):

Jan van Naaldwijk, who lived in 1503, was married to Miss Geertruid van Haeften, from Gelderland; his children:
- Adriaan, inheritor of his fief;
- Willem van Naaldwijk, monk in the abbey of Middelburg;
- Hendrik van Naaldwijk, who married the young lady N. van Alphen; they lived in 1570 and had a child, Hendrik van Naaldwijk, who died as a young man in Spain;
- Jan van Naaldwijk, regular canon there, and prothonotary in Rome;
- Miss Alijt van Naaldwijk, who was initially a nun, but then married Anthonis van Liederkerke, physician to the Duke of Cleves;
- Miss Barbara van Naaldwijk: she married N. van Kuyck, lord of Meteren.

Later genealogies show that Jan’s descendants ended up on opposite sides of the fissures in Dutch society laid bare during the Reformation and the Dutch Revolt: while his son Jan became a high papal official in Rome, his granddaughter Josina van Naaldwijk, daughter of Adriaan, married Adriaan van Swieten, one of the earliest supporters of William of Orange.

In contrast to manuscripts containing medieval chronicles such as Beke’s, which are usually held in libraries, those with the series of *adelskronieken* are now often kept in

---

1028 Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 6 D 9 (cat. 1185), fol. 95v (see Fig. 26): ‘Adriaen willems derde zoon hadde te wiue joncvrouwe dircks van haeften daer hy an wan een soon gheeten jan die te wyve hadde ’; the same at The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 131 G 31, fol. 76r.


A different context for the diffusion of these works is also suggested by their layout. While some of the manuscripts are formatted like late medieval chronicles, in others the texts are displayed on the page similarly to legal documents (cf. Figures 32 and 33): in a single column on unbound bifolio pages, folded and stitched together in quires, occasionally with a crease indicating that the page had been folded once over in the middle for storage. They tend to be written in a rapid cursive documentary script and have indented title headings with elaborate otiose strokes. Further evidence for the use of historical texts, both medieval and later, in administrative contexts in the early modern period is found in a number of manuscripts assembled by burgomasters. Several such manuscripts with historical information were used by successive generations of municipal officials.

---

1031 E.g., The Hague, Nationaal Archief, Familiearchief Cousebant ca. 1400–1800 (inv. 3.20.09), no. 1051; Utrecht, Utrechts Archief, 293, zwart (olim Booth A 7); Haarlem, Noord-Hollands Archief, Collectie van losse aanwinsten (inv. 176), no. 460.

1032 E.g., The Hague, Nationaal Archief, Cousebant no. 1051, made up of four unbound quires, stitched together. See also the chronicles referred to below, nn. 1033-1034. Adelskronieken are not the only contemporary chronicles found in this format: see, e.g., Haarlem, Noord-Hollands Archief, Collectie losse aanwinsten (inv. 176), no. 1540. See below, n. 1035.

1033 E.g., The Hague, Nationaal Archief, Familiearchief Cousebant ca. 1400–1800 (inv. 3.20.09), no. 1041.

1034 E.g., The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 131 G 31; Alkmaar, Collectie aanwinsten, no. 418 (a photocopy; the original is kept in the ‘Archiv. Prov. Neerl. S. J.’, i.e., Nijmegen, Archief Nederlandse provincie der Jezuïeten).

1035 E.g., Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS BPL 136 D (the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, made in 1463 by Steven Hendrikszoon, later burgomaster of Haarlem; see ibid., fol. 74r); Haarlem, Noord-Hollands Archief, Losse aanwinsten, no. 1540 (fol. 65r: ‘Een kort verhael van tgeen in Hollant ende den omleggende plaetsen geschydt is’, compiled in 1572-5 from notes by Jacob Matthijsz Rol, burgomaster of Purmerend). For other examples see also S. Langereis, Geschiedenis als ambacht. Oudheidkunde in de Gouden Eeuw: Arnoldus Buchelius en Petrus Scrivius (Hilversum, 2001), p. 161. Several city histories were also compiled by burgomasters and aldermen, e.g., A. Huygen (burgomaster of Doesburg), see Haitsma Mulier, Repertorium, p. 208 (no. 253); J. van Vliet (alderman and secretary of Breda), see ibid., p. 425 (no. 495); J. van Hout (de facto municipal archivist of Leiden), see ibid., p. 202 (no. 243); C. Booth (alderman, treasurer and burgomaster of Leiden, as well as librarian of the university), see ibid., p. 58 (no. 73).

1036 E.g., Alkmaar, Regionaal Archief, Collectie aanwinsten, no. 3; compiled by Jacob Dircksz Wijnkoper (d. 1599), churchwarden and burgomaster of Alkmaar, continued by his son Jan Jacobsz Stoop, himself an alderman; The Hague, Nationaal Archief, Third Department (inv. 3.22.01.01), MS 751, assembled from material collected by consecutive burgomasters, as evidenced by information on a pastedown on the front board and on fol. 53r.
Fig. 34: Haarlem, Noord-Hollands Archief, Losse collectie van aanwinsten (inv. 176), no. 1045, p. 24: Anthonius Hovaeus, *Chronyck ende historie van het edele ende machtige gheslachte vanden huysse van Egmondt*, in manuscript (photocopy)
Some chronicles of noble families appear to have been of particular interest to readers in the later sixteenth century and afterwards; the history of the house of Egmond is the most prominent example. The continuing dissemination of historical information about this family shows how medieval historical material could find a new life in the early modern period. The history of Egmond is an offshoot of the chronicle tradition of Holland; the roots of the family are traced to the Frisian king Radbod, who played an important role in stories about the conversion of the region by St Willibrord. The first independent texts about the lords of Egmond were compiled in the second half of the fifteenth century, although the oldest manuscripts date to the sixteenth century; later versions appeared in both the Latin and Dutch series of adelskronieken. Johannes a Leydis and Dirk Frankenszoon Pauw incorporated material about the house of Egmond in their chronicles. The information of Johannes a Leydis was taken up in the Divisiekroniek, which was the main source on which Anthonius Hovaeus, a monk at Egmond, based his ‘Chronicle or History of the Noble Lords and Barons of Egmond’, written in the mid-1550s. This work was eventually printed in 1630 and a total of fifteen editions were published in the seventeenth century. As with other chronicles of the time, the printed version was updated in later editions.

The first printed edition of the Egmond chronicle has a dedication to the burgomasters and vroedschappen of Alkmaar and to the burgomasters and aldermen of Egmond. The many relatively cheap reprints indicate that it was also attractive to a much broader section of the population, a large part of which had no personal connection to Egmond. The chronicle also continued to be transcribed in manuscript, the antiquarian historian

---

1037 For the medieval tradition, see Carasso-Kok, Repertorium, pp. 190-3. A more modest example is the house of Arkel: Kemp, Leven.
1038 E.g., Jan Beke, Croniken van den stichte van Utrecht ende van Hollant, ed. H. Bruch (The Hague, 1982), pp. 13-14 (cap. 12), but not by Jan in MS Cotton Vitellius F xv; see above, Chapter 1, p. 38, n. 119.
1039 Carasso-Kok, Repertorium, pp. 190-91 (respectively nos 164-5 and 166-8).
1040 Ibid., p. 190; see also p. 433 for a manuscript by Willem van Berchen.
1042 A. Hovaeus, Kronyck ende historie van het edele ende machtige geslachte vanden huys van Egmondt (Alkmaar, 1630). Several of the printed editions contain references in the margins to chapters of the Divisiekroniek (referred to as ‘Cronica Holland.’).
1043 E.g., in [A. Hovaeus], Kronyck ende historie van het edele ende machtige geslachte vanden huys van Egmondt (Amsterdam, 1696), with a continuation to 1655.
1044 Hovaeus, Kronyck, sig. a2r-v, signed by ‘Thomas Pietersen Baart Boeckdrucker ende Boeckvercooper.’
1045 See also Kist, ‘Kronyk’.
Petrus Scriverius made a copy in a neat humanist hand;\textsuperscript{1046} but there is also an amateurishly illustrated codex from the seventeenth century, which clearly was not intended for scholarly use but rather for personal enjoyment (Fig. 34).\textsuperscript{1047} Another copy was included in a manuscript containing a register of the fiefs of Egmond, produced for administrative purposes by Boudewijn van Rietwijk, a clerk of the house of Egmond between 1602 and 1631.\textsuperscript{1048}

The reason for the renewed and widespread interest in the history of the Egmond family no doubt lies in the fate of the most famous Lord of Egmond, Lamoraal I, whose tragic end later inspired Goethe to write a tragedy (Egmont), for which Beethoven composed incidental music (opus 84). The continuation of the chronicle described how Lamoraal and Philip de Montmorency, count of Horne, were captured in Brussels in 1567 at the behest of Philip II,\textsuperscript{1049} and how the Duke of Alba, on his own initiative – illegally, according to the report in the chronicle – ordered their execution. After the full text of ‘the criminal sentence of the count of Egmond’,\textsuperscript{1050} there is a long account of the execution.\textsuperscript{1051} Lamoraal of Egmond was seen as one of the very first martyrs of the Dutch Revolt,\textsuperscript{1052} a point made explicitly in the chronicle: ‘By this action the Duke of Alba excited a great hatred of himself and received the name of a tyrant.’\textsuperscript{1053}

Once again, however, we see that medieval history could be re-appropriated to serve new purposes, since the same text served as propaganda for the role of the Catholic heritage in the genesis of the Dutch Republic. Johannes Stichter’s edition of the chronicle, from 1696, includes a further addition at the end, a ‘Short History and Register of all the

\textsuperscript{1046} The Hague, Nationaal Archief, Archief van de familie Van Hoogstraten (inv. 2.21.333.02), no. 15, on loose leafs.
\textsuperscript{1047} Haarlem, Noord-Hollands Archief, Collectie van losse aanwinsten (inv. 176), no. 1045.
\textsuperscript{1048} The Hague, Nationaal Archief, Archief van de Leenhoven en Leenhoven en Registerkamer van Holland, 1520–1807 (inv. 3.01.52), no. 149, at fols 115r-135v.
\textsuperscript{1049} Hovaeus, Chronyck, pp. 89-90.
\textsuperscript{1050} Ibid., pp. 90-92: ‘Copie van de Criminele Sententie, over de Grave van Egmondt’.
\textsuperscript{1051} Ibid., pp. 92-7.
\textsuperscript{1052} H. van Nuffel, Lamoraal van Egmont in de geschiedenis, literatuur, beeldende kunst en legende (Leuven, 1968), who describes how the execution became (p. 6) ‘het symbool van de onderdrukte vrijheid, een slachtoffer van het fanatiek despotisme en een vrijheidsheld’, surveys the artistic responses to the events (pp. 29-32), but ignores the chronicle.
\textsuperscript{1053} Hovaeus, Chronyck, p. 97: ‘Den Hertoghe van Alba heeft hier door een grooten haet op hem gheladen, ende den naem van een Tyran door dit Feyt verkregen’.
Abbots of Egmond, from the First Foundation of the Abbey until its Destruction. It finishes:

In 1567, this beautiful abbey was lamentably set fire by soldiers, and everything was looted; and at present one can see only two ancient towers of the monastery church, with some dilapidated parts of the walls. This abbey was of the Order of St Benedict, and most of the old counts of Holland lie buried there. Thus, this famous abbey, which in the final years before the Reformation here in these parts was no different from a royal palace, was destroyed and ruined.

By stressing the historical links between the house of Egmond and its monastic foundation, the conclusion shows how, in the same year that the house of Egmond became a martyr to Dutch liberty through the capture of Lamoraal I, the medieval abbey of Egmond, lamentably (‘jammerlijck’) destroyed by Reformed soldiers, became a martyr to Catholicism. Lamoraal’s reputation as an exemplary Catholic helped to enforce this connection. The two institutions which had shaped the history of Egmond in the Middle Ages, its lords and its monastery, could thus be presented as fulfilling their destiny in the larger history of the Dutch Republic, and Roman Catholics could take pride in both.

CURRENT AFFAIRS AND TOPICAL HISTORIES
While late medieval genres such as the regional chronicle and the *adelskroniek* reached new audiences, the sixteenth century also witnessed a great diversification in historical

---


1055 Hovaeus, *Kronyck*, p. 126: ‘Dese schoone abdye werde anno 1567 van de soldaten jammerlijck aen brandt gesteken, ende alles berooft, ende siet men nu aldaer maer twee seer oude torens van de kloosters-kerck staen, met eenige andere vervalle stuche muyrs: dese abdye was van de ordre van Sinte Benedictus, daer de oude graven van Hollandt meest begraven leggen. Aldus is dese vermaerde abdye te gronde gegaen en geruineert, welcke in de laeste jaren voor de Reformatie hier te lande niet anders en was geweest dan een conincklijke paleys.’


This was the result of the wider application and further development of genres already extant in the Middle Ages, though perhaps less widespread, combined with an increasing effort to emulate classical models. Simultaneously, the period saw a considerable rise in the number of historical works available to an ever-growing readership – a development which, as I have attempted to show in this dissertation, is already reflected in the experience of Jan van Naaldwijk as an early sixteenth-century consumer of historical texts.

An important new trend was the growing number of histories focused on a particular theme or a relatively short span of time. The preference of medieval historians – and, judging from the manuscript diffusion, of readers as well – had predominantly been for works that went from the earliest times (almost) to the present day. Despite a small number of exceptions in the Middle Ages, it is fair to say that, starting in the early sixteenth century, more accounts of local disturbances and conflicts survive, and in all probability were written, including works such as Willem Hermans’s *Olandie Gelrieque bellum*, the first printed example from Holland. More chronicles dealing with shorter periods of history also began to be composed and to be printed. In the course of the sixteenth century, eye-witness reports of recent events were published, often not long after the incidents they described – an account of the siege of Haarlem (1573) came out in Leiden while the siege was still going on.

It seems likely that the popularity of shorter, more topical, forms of historical writing in the sixteenth century – including the growing biographical output, influenced partly by Italian Renaissance humanism, and partly by a patriotic desire to celebrate episodes in

---

1058 An invaluable resource for the study of historiography of the Netherlands from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries is Haitsma Mulier, *Repertorium*, available online at www.dbnl.nl.

1059 E.g., the *Bella campestria* (14th century) is an early example of a thematic history, listing the battles between the counts of Holland and the bishops of Utrecht from 1018 to 1301, with very little additional historical framing (A. Matthaeus [ed.], *De rebus ultrajectinis et inprimis de bello cum Covordensibus, Tarantis, seu Drentinis olim gesto auctoris incerti* [Leiden, 1690], pp. 179-84). A 16th-century curiosity is the *Belech van Utert voor Ijsselsteyn*, a poem describing the siege of IJsselstein in 1511 (Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 6 E 13 [cat. 1263]).

1060 Willem Hermans, *Olandie Gelrieque bellum* (Amsterdam, n.d.).

1061 An early example is *Wonderlijcke oorloghen*, a history of the Low Countries under Maximilian 1477-82, found bound with MS Cotton Tiberius C iv.


1063 Haitsma Mulier, *Repertorium*, no. 402 (pp. 348-9).

1064 E.g., K. van Mander, *Het schilder-boeck waer in voor eerst de leerlustighe iughten der grondt der edel vry schilderconst in verscheeyden deelen wort voorghedraghen* (Haarlem, 1604), fols 196r-300v; see fol.
the new nation’s history\textsuperscript{1065} – was due, firstly, to increased demand, caused by the dramatic consequences of recent events on the daily life of inhabitants of the Netherlands, and, secondly, to the possibilities offered by the printing press (and intensified by an increasingly competitive market) of rapid production and distribution of smaller works: not only pamphlets, but also song sheets and song books, which often included a large number of lyrics connected to contemporary history.\textsuperscript{1066} Brief printed works on specific topics provided an alternative to lengthy histories covering a long span of time.\textsuperscript{1067} As we have seen, however, this same development of gearing historical works towards the opportunities presented by the printing press, far from spelling the end of the medieval chronicle, may have aided its survival into the early modern period.\textsuperscript{1068}

At the same time, these shorter forms of historical writing, which started to be gathered together into thematic histories of the Dutch Revolt,\textsuperscript{1069} led to the development of a more retrospective tradition.\textsuperscript{1070} Initially such works were often connected to medieval chronicles – an important example is the continuation of the \textit{Divisiekroniek}.\textsuperscript{1071} Then came the first generation of historians of the Revolt: Emanuel van Meteren, Pieter

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{1065}{E.g., the works of Isaac Commelin, see Haitsma Mulier, \textit{Repertorium}, no. 117 (pp. 98-9).}
\footnotetext{1067}{P. A. M. Geurts, \textit{De Nederlandse Opstand in de pamfletten 1566-1584} (Nijmegen, 1956), p. 301: ‘history, above all the story of the Revolt, crops up in almost every pamphlet.’ For the historical content in political pamphlets of the late sixteenth century, see J. Romein, ‘Spieghel historiael van de tachtigjarige oorlog’, in idem et al. (eds), \textit{De tachtigjarige oorlog} (Amsterdam, 1941), pp. 1-31, at 8-15.}
\footnotetext{1068}{See above, pp. 223-229.}
\footnotetext{1069}{E.g., F. Galle, \textit{Een cort verhael van de gedincweerdichste saken die in de xvij. provincien vande Nederlanden van daghe tot daghe geschiset zijn, sedert den iare ons Heeren MDLXVI totten iare MDLXIX} (Antwerp, 1579); see B. A. Vermaseren, ‘De Antwerpse graveur Filips Galle en zijn kronieke over de Opstand (1579)’, \textit{De Gulden Passer} 35 (1957), pp. 139-47.}
\footnotetext{1070}{Romein, ‘Spieghel historiael’, pp. 3 and 14-16, sees this as the preamble to the third phase in the development of historiography about the Eighty Years’ War, the first connected accounts; phases one and two consisted of reports of first-hand experience and the earliest descriptions, while the subsequent phases are characterized by increasing comprehensiveness and analysis.}
\footnotetext{1071}{In successive versions by Ellert de Veer; for the publication history, see Haitsma Mulier, \textit{Repertorium}, pp. 415-6. The first version was published appended to the \textit{Divisiekroniek in Die cronycke van Hollant, Zeelant ende Vriestant ... Noch is hier bygehvoecht een cort verhael vande Regeringe ende ghedenkweerdichste gheschiedenissten toten jare 1584} (Dordrecht and Delft, 1585).}
\end{footnotes}
Christiaenzoon Bor and Everhard van Reyd.¹⁰⁷² Like Jan van Naaldwijk and other traditional chroniclers, each followed a strictly chronological, ‘annalistic approach’, justifying the description of them as ‘chroniclers and annalists’.¹⁰⁷³ Nevertheless, their works represent four different types of synthesizing history: while van Meteren’s history was primarily narrative-driven, van Reyd’s history was polemical.¹⁰⁷⁴ Bor’s was primarily a collection of documentary sources,¹⁰⁷⁵ but he also added a didactic history in verse.¹⁰⁷⁶ These works were continuously updated,¹⁰⁷⁷ and derivative histories of the


¹⁰⁷³ Janssen, ‘“Tris historica”’, p. 9.


¹⁰⁷⁶ P. C. Bor, *Den oorspronck, begin ende aenavck der Nederlantscher oorlogen ... in liedekens vervaet* (Leiden, 1617). It has been argued that this work represented the same humanist stylistic ideal of historiography that inspired Janus Dousa Sr to write his metrical Latin history (see E. O. G. Haitsma Mulier, ‘Geschiedschrijving op rijm in Nederland in de beginnende zeventiende eeuw. Dousa, Bor en Wachtendorp, bien étonnés de se trouver ensemble?’, in J. Tollebeek, G. Verbeek and T. Verschaffel [eds], *De lectuur van het verleden. Opstellen over de geschiedenis van de geschiedschrijving in de zeventiende eeuw naar Reginald de Schryver* [Leuven, 1998], pp. 189-205). Nevertheless, there is a marked difference in the intended readership: Bor, *Den oorspronck*, sig. (:)3v, contrasts the serious aims of his prose history with that of his verse history, which he says he wrote ‘tot vermaecchinghe der Nederlantscher vrouwen ende jeucht, de welcke meestendeel het hooft ende sinnen ongeerne met veel leesens quellen, ende nochtans wel geerne van alles wetenschap souden begeeren te hebben’.

Revolt soon followed,\textsuperscript{1078} as did accounts of the Reformation,\textsuperscript{1079} although attempts to compile an official history of the Reformation came to nothing.\textsuperscript{1080}

Even in those works which focused primarily on the recent past, aspects of the medieval historical tradition could continue to play a part. A possible indication, for example, that van Meteren was influenced by Jan’s distinctive manner of historical writing can be seen in his account of the origins of the Burgundian Netherlands, which he concludes – in contrast to his concise treatment of the history of this period – with a long exemplary narrative of the sort that Jan occasionally inserted into his first chronicle: a ‘memorable example of good justice’ carried out by Duke Charles the Bold against one of his officers who had abused his position of authority.\textsuperscript{1081} Just as Jan did when recounting such anecdotes – for instance, the miracles of the crucifix or of the Mountain of Fortune\textsuperscript{1082} – van Meteren, at the end of his account, which was based on a single source,\textsuperscript{1083} added references to two similar episodes, one of which he could have found in Jan’s first chronicle, although it was also available in many other works, including the \textit{Divisiekroniek}:

A similar example of severe and appropriate judgement is told about Willem III, Count of Hainault, Holland, Zealand, etc., who, since it was the duty of his office to punish such violence, had a bailiff of South Holland decapitated in his presence, because he had forcibly taken and exchanged a fat cow from a farmer; and the count himself handed the executioner the sword.\textsuperscript{1084}

\textsuperscript{1078} E.g., J. Gysius, \textit{Oorsprong en voortgang der Neder-landtscher beroerten ende ellendicheden ([Leiden], 1616), see sig. .1v for the sources; W. Baudartius, \textit{Morghen-wecker der vrye Nederlantsche provintien} (‘Danswick’, 1610), see Haitsma Mulier, \textit{Repertorium}, no. 35 (pp. 28-30); see further J. C. Breen, ‘Gereformeerde populaire historiografie in de 17e en 18e eeuw’, \textit{Tijdschrift voor geschiedenis} 37 (1922), pp. 254-73, 372-82.

\textsuperscript{1079} E.g., the work of Frederik de Vrij; see Haitsma Mulier, \textit{Repertorium}, no. 504 (pp. 433-4).


\textsuperscript{1081} Meteren, \textit{Historie}, fols 4r-5r, at 4r: ‘een ghedenkweerdig exempel van goeder Justicie’. The narrative is not in the earlier editions.

\textsuperscript{1082} See above, Chapter 2, pp. 139-140, 148.

\textsuperscript{1083} Meteren, \textit{Historie}, fol. 4r: ‘alsoo ons Pontus Heuterus van Delf beschrijft’; i.e., P. Heuterus, \textit{Rerum Burgundicarum libri sex} (Antwerp, 1584), pp. 165-7.

\textsuperscript{1084} Meteren, \textit{Historie}, fol. 5r: ‘Diergelielie exempel van strenghe ende goede Justicie leestmen van Graef Willem de derde, van Henegouw, Hollandt, ende Zeelandt, etc. die een Bailliu van Zuyt-Hollandt, om een vette Koe eenen Boer afgenomen ende ghemangelt hadde, als ghewelt, diens officie was ghewelt te straffen, dedem sijn presentie onthalsen, selve den Beul t’sweert inde handt gevende.’ Heuterus, \textit{Rerum Burgundicarum libri sex}, p. 167, refers to the story, but does not give any details. The full story is in MS
These cautionary tales of the abuse of power by officers of the sovereign offered support for the view, shared by many in the Dutch Republic, that it had been the Duke of Alba’s actions rather than those of his lord, Philip II, which had provoked the Revolt. Later in the work, van Meteren argued for the sovereignty of the individual principalities – now provinces – of the Netherlands; and he also maintained that the power of rulers over the affairs of these principalities was accepted only on the condition that they honoured the privileges granted by previous lords. This was one of the ways in which the history of the region in the Middle Ages continued to play a part in topical political debates: the medieval counties could be represented – although not without some massaging of the facts – as prefiguring the government of the States which made up the Dutch Republic. On the other hand, the seventeenth-century re-appropriation of these medieval narratives illustrates how historical episodes which had carried a particular meaning in one context (e.g., a morality tale about the importance of strict and proper justice by the sovereign over his officials) could receive a different and sometimes almost diametrically opposed significance in another setting (e.g., a justification for the States to take over their own sovereignty when a prince was thought to have misbehaved).

While histories of the Reformation or of the Dutch Revolt, focused, for obvious reasons, on recent events, apologies for the Catholic Church, which were printed in the southern Netherlands from the late sixteenth century onwards, presented, for equally obvious reasons, a continuous – and positive – history of the Church in the Low Countries, both southern and northern, and therefore could rely on medieval chronicles as evidence. But Catholic apologists were not the only ones to make polemical use of medieval

Cotton Vitellius F xv, fol. 113r-v, but also in, e.g., Divisiekroniek, fol. 202r-v (div. 22, cap. 32). See also below, n. 1148.

1085 See, e.g., below, p. 238, for this view expressed in a chronicle of the lords of Egmond.

1086 Meteren, Historie, fol. 36v: ‘dat de Graven van Hollant sijn keysers in haer Graefschap.’ Hugo Grotius is cited. The passage is not in earlier editions, and it may have been an addition by Grotius himself: L. Brummel, Twee ballingen ’s lands tijdens onze opstand tegen Spanje. Hugo Blotius, 1534–1608, Emanuel van Meteren, 1535–1612 (The Hague, 1972), p. 166.

1087 Meteren, Historie, fol. 37r: foreign historians, according to him, were mistaken when they treated the Netherlanders as subjects.

1088 E.g., F. Haraeus, Onpartijdighe verclaringhe der oorsaken des Nederlantsche oorlooghs sedert t’jaer 1566 tot 1608 (Antwerp, 1612), see B. A. Vermaseren, De katholieke Nederlandsche geschiedschrijving in de XVIe en XVIIe eeuw over den opstand (Maastricht, 1941), pp. 223-46; H. de Coster, Historie van d'outheyt ende den voortganck des heylich, christen, catholijck, apostolijck, ende roomsche gheloove, in dese Belgische Nederlanden (Antwerp, 1591), sig. d3v: ‘Cronijck boexken (dwele by een ghevueght is, wt oprechte ende ghelooofweerdighe Historien en Cronijcken)’. 
history: François Francken famously appropriated this material to argue for the sovereignty of the States, constructing an historical foundation, based on medieval politics, to justify the rebellion against Philip II.\(^{1089}\)

Even after Hugo Grotius had placed classical antiquity at the centre of debates about the Republic’s political constitution, with the publication in 1610 of his *Liber de antiquitate reipublicae Batavicae* and its Dutch version, *Tractaet vande oudheyt vande Batavische nu Hollandsche republique* (‘Treatise of the Antiquity of the Batavian now Holland’s Republic’),\(^{1090}\) the history of the medieval county of Holland still continued to be exploited for political ends. Pieter de la Court, for example, in his polemical chronicle *Historie der gravelike regering in Holland* (‘History of the Government by the Counts in Holland’),\(^{1091}\) argued for a republican constitution and against the increased powers of the stadholders: time and again, he pointed out in the introduction, the counts had ‘destroyed or ruined these lands’ by their abuses of power.\(^{1092}\) It was impossible, he maintained, to write a contemporary history along similar lines – ideally, he would have liked to continue his work with a description of the period from Emperor Charles V to 1651 – because ‘all our historians flatter the House of Nassau so shamelessly, enlarging upon all their virtues and suppressing or concealing their vices, that they appear to have been not humans, but angels. Therefore, these authors do not provide adequate information.’\(^{1093}\)

The history of the counts will, however, suffice to demonstrate the


\(^{1092}\) *Court*, *Historie*, ‘voor-reeden tot den leeser’, sigs *3v-*4v: ‘Hoe meenigmalen zy dese Landen hebben verwoest, ofte verdorven, meenende zig te verrijken met de Landen hunner naaburen.’

\(^{1093}\) Ibid., sigs *4v-*5r: ‘soo pluimstrijken ter contrarie alle onse Historie-Schrijvers onse Stadhouders uit den Huize van Nassow soo onbeschamendelijk met alle haare Deugden op het breedsten uit te meeten, en haare Ondeugden te verswijgen ofte te bedekken; dat ’t selven geen menschen, maar Engelen schijnen geweest te zijn: sulks uit de zelve Schrijvers geen genoegsmae onderrigting te halen is.’
benefits and disasters that have befallen Holland because of monarchical government, so that a rational person will easily be able to deduce from it whether, under these circumstances, it would be beneficial to establish a political and military leader, provided with a standing army, in the Republic of Holland.\textsuperscript{1094}

\textsuperscript{1094} Ibid., sig. *5r: ‘Daar-en-boven dunkt my dat die Gravelyke Historien ons overvloediglik konnen onderrigten van de heylen ofte onheylen, die Holland door een-Hoofdige Regeering zijn oovergekomen: en dat een verstandig mensch, zeer ligtelijk daar uit zal konnen besluiten, of het in deese gelegentheid dienstig zy, een Politik en Militair Hooft, voorsien met een geduurige Krijgsmagt, in de Hollandse Republike in te voeren.’
EARLY MODERN HISTORICAL WRITING AND THE MEDIEVAL CHRONICLE TRADITION

Such polemical works, which deploy historical arguments to support political ideologies, are far removed from traditional narrative histories. Their roots can be found in the historical experiments of the early sixteenth century. Following Johannes a Leydis’s Latin histories, which were largely derivative of the chronicle tradition of Holland, Latin historical writing gained a new impetus at this time.\textsuperscript{1095} A small number of authors, inspired, to different degrees and in different ways, by humanism, together made an unrivalled impact on the historians, humanist and antiquarian alike, of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Each of these early sixteenth-century authors held special significance for a particular region of the Dutch Low Countries: Cornelius Aurelius and Reinier Snoy for Holland and thus the western Netherlands;\textsuperscript{1096} Wilhelmus Heda for Utrecht;\textsuperscript{1097} Gerard Geldenhouwer (Noviomagus) for Guelders and the eastern Netherlands;\textsuperscript{1098} Hadrianus Barlandus for Brabant and the south.\textsuperscript{1099}

\textsuperscript{1095} The move from largely derivative works (those of Pauli, as well as of Johannes a Leydis) to more independent experiments in historiography mirrors developments in vernacular historical writing c. 1400, see above, Chapter 1, p. 41.


\textsuperscript{1097} A remarkable number of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century manuscripts of Heda’s history survive: e.g., Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MSS 6 E 10 (cat. 783); 6 F 9 (cat. 788); 4 K 2 (cat. 791); 4 K 3 (cat. 790); 6 E 2 (cat. 791); 6 E 11 (cat. 792). The published editions are: W. Heda, Historia episcoporum Trajectensis, ed. S. Petri and B. Furmerius, in their Historia veterum episcoporum Ultrajectinae sedis, et comitum Hollandiae (Franeker, 1612), pp. 193-426; W. Heda, Historia episcoporum Ultrajectensis, ed. A. Buchelius, in his Ioannes de Beka, canonnicus Ultrajectinus, et Wilhelmus Heda, praepositus Arnhemensis, de episcopis Ultrajectinis, recoginiti et notis historiciis illustrati (Utrecht, 1643). For Heda, see Haitsma Mulier, Repertorium, pp. 177-8; J. J. B. M. M. Sterk, Philips van Bourgondië (1465-1524) bisschop van Utrecht als protagonist van de Renaissance. Zijn leven en maecenaat (Zutphen, 1980).


\textsuperscript{1099} H. Barlandus, Hollandiae comitum historia et icones (Leiden, 1584); further reprints appeared in 1585 and 1603. Idem, Rerum gestarum a Brabantiae ducibus historia (Antwerp, 1526); the work was reprinted in 1551, 1566, 1580, 1600 and 1603; a revised version came out in 1532, a Dutch translation in 1555 and a French one in 1603 and 1612. Idem, De Hollandiae principibus (Antwerp, 1519). It was reprinted in 1520, together with a list of the bishops of Utrecht and a life of Charles of Burgundy, both assembled from information in the Divisiekronek, under the title Libelli tres (Antwerp, 1520). For Barlandus, see Haitsma Mulier, Repertorium, p. 21-2; E. Daxhelet, Adrien Barlandus, humaniste Belge. 1486-1538 (Leuven, 1938).
While their works were doubtless innovative, we can nevertheless identify in them a legacy from the chronicle tradition of the Middle Ages. In spite of his thoroughgoing humanism, for instance, Snoy’s history still contained many of the stories which medieval chronicles would later be criticized for including: for example, he retains the story of the giants of Albion because it does not necessarily conflict with Tacitus; and he recounts the tale of the countess of Hennenberg, though qualifying it with the phrase ‘ut fertur’ (‘as they say’). He omits the Wilten and Slaven from the earliest history of the region because their presence at that point contradicts Tacitus; nevertheless, he reintroduces them later on, in a period when their settlement in Holland does not conflict with the Tacitean account. The Latin history of the dukes of Brabant (1526) of Hadrianus Barlandus consists mostly of translated excerpts from the Divisiekroniek, with some additional information from authors such as Robert Gaguin and Flavio Biondo – these were apparently the ‘foreign’ sources available to early sixteenth-century historians of the Dutch Low Countries. Like Jan’s chronicles and the Divisiekroniek, as well as the medieval regional chronicle tradition underlying them, Barlandus’s historical works were structured according to the lives of successive rulers.

Among humanists, the identification of the Batavians as the ancestors of the Hollanders was slowly established during the final decade of the fifteenth century and the first decade of the sixteenth, although the exact chronology is still a matter of dispute. Erasmus’s Auris Batava (‘The Batavian Ear’), which was included as the final

---

1102 Snoy, De rebus Batavicis libri XIII, p. 87.
1103 H. Kampinga, De opvattingen over onze oudere vaderlandsche geschiedenis bij de Hollandsche historici der XV1e en XV11e eeuw (The Hague, 1917), p. 57; Snoy, De rebus Batavicis libri XIII, p. 23.
1104 See Daxhelet, Adrien Barlandus, pp. 113-22.
1105 I. Bejczy, ‘Drie humanisten en een mythe. De betekenis van Erasmus, Aurelius en Geldenhouwer voor de Bataafse kwestie’, Tijdschrift voor geschiedenis 109 (1996), pp. 467-84, at 468-9; the first printed work to identify the Batavians with the Hollanders was apparently the repertory of names in Caesar’s Bellum Gallicum by Raimundus Marlianus (d. 1475), which from 1477 onwards was often printed together with editions of Caesar: see Erasmus, ‘Auris Batava’, ed. A. Wesseling, in his Opera omnia, II.8 (Amsterdam, etc., 1997), pp. 36-44, at 37.

Cornelius Aurelius’s engagement with the history of the Batavians was apparently sparked by the activities of Gerard Geldenhouwer, a friend of Barlandus and Erasmus.\footnote{Kampinga, Opvattingen, pp. 4-5.} Geldenhouwer argued that the Batavians had inhabited a region covering much of the northern Low Countries, including his native Guelders – a claim deliberately misinterpreted by his opponents, who claimed that he had excluded Holland.\footnote{Geldenhouwer, Historische werken, p. 21; see also Bejczy, ‘Drie humanisten’.} Aurelius countered Geldenhouwer’s interpretation of the classical sources by arguing that the county of Holland had the exclusive claim to the title insula Batavorum. In the late sixteenth century, Aurelius’s assertion won the day, not on the strength of his arguments, but on account of Holland’s economical and political power.\footnote{I. Schöffer, ‘The Batavian Myth during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries’, in P. A. M. Geurts and A. E. M. Janssen (eds), Geschiedschrijving in Nederland. Studies over de historiografie van de Nieuwe Tijd, II: Geschiedbenoeming (The Hague, 1981), pp. 85-109, at 89-90. The debate, however, lasted well into the eighteenth century.}

Sandra Langereis has recently refuted the view that Dutch humanist historians of the early years of the Dutch Republic were primarily preoccupied with the Batavian story and did not pay much attention to the history of the Middle Ages.\footnote{Expressed by, e.g., E. O. G. Haitasma Mulier, ‘De eerste Hollandse stadsbeschrijvingen uit de zeventiende eeuw’, De zeventiende eeuw 9 (1993), pp. 97-116, at 100, and K. Tilmans, ‘De Trojaanse mythe voorbij. Of: waarom de Kattendijke-kroniek alleen door Bockenberg opgemerkt werd’, It beaken 56 (1994), pp. 188-211, at 188. See Langereis, Geschiedenis, pp. 17-19.} She has argued convincingly that humanist, as well as antiquarian, historians of this period took a keen interest in the medieval history of the region.\footnote{The same is true throughout Europe: see D. R. Kelley, ‘Humanism and History’, in A. Rabil Jr (ed.), Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms and Legacy, III (Philadelphia, 1988), pp. 236-70, at 258.} The dispute between Geldenhouwer and Aurelius indicates that, in addition, issues which had already been debated in medieval histories, such as the place of a ‘Greater Holland’ within the earliest history of the region, continued to be discussed in the historical discourse of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. While the author of the Divisiekronek and Geldenhouwer still adhered to the idea of a ‘Greater Holland’ before its division into the diocese of Utrecht and the county of Holland, this notion was challenged by the Batavian story as told by Aurelius and
adapted by later historians. Wilhelmus Heda, meanwhile, identified Batavia with a ‘Greater Holland’, but saw Holland as an illegitimate breakaway entity, a claim which the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ had attributed long before to the bishop of Utrecht.\footnote{Kampinga, Opvattingen, pp. 89-92; cf. ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, sig. c5v: ‘om dat hollant in voer leden tiden ghestaen heeft onder dat bisdom, ende dattet mijn voervaders heerlicheyt heeft gheweest, soe hadde ic dat gaerne weder gehadt’.}

As all this makes clear, the changes which have been perceived by modern scholars as advances in historical method were neither absolute nor immediate, nor were they necessarily more pronounced in authors with a more humanist persuasion. Even towards the end of the sixteenth century, for instance, the rigorously humanist Hadrianus Junius,\footnote{See B. A. Vermaseren, ‘Het ontstaan van Hadrianus Junius’ “Batavia”’, in Huldeboek pater Dr Bonaventura Kruitwagen o.f.m. (The Hague, 1949), pp. 407-26; J. A. van Dorsten, Poets, Patrons and Professors: Sir Philip Sidney, Daniel Rogers, and the Leiden Humanists (Leiden and London, 1962); I. M. Veldman, ‘Enkele aanvullende gegevens omtrent de biografie van Hadrianus Junius’, Bijdragen en mededelingen betreffende de geschiedenis der Nederlanden 89 (1974), pp. 375-84.} perhaps on account of his Catholicism,\footnote{For Junius’s Catholicism, see D. K. W. van Miert, ‘The Religious Beliefs of Hadrianus Junius (1511-1575)’, in R. Schuur (ed.), Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Cantabrigiensis, Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies (Tempe, 2003), pp. 583-94.} but certainly in contravention of sound historical judgement, reported the story of the 365 children of the Countess of Hennenberg.\footnote{H. Junius, Batavia, ed. J. Dousa Sr (Leiden, 1588), p. 347.}

Pieter Corneliszoon Bockenberg, who was of a more antiquarian disposition, but no less serious a scholar, was eager to maintain King Donkey’s Ears, even if he did offer an alternative explanation of the nickname, with classical credentials to boot: it was not his long ears, but his resemblance in character and wealth to King Midas which earned him his nickname.\footnote{Kampinga, Opvattingen, p. 46; P. C. Bockenberg, Prisci Bataviae et Frisiae reges. Item, Lugduni Batavorum; et Wassenarum heroum; vetustissimarum Hollandiae gentium; et historia et genealogia (Leiden, 1589), p. 103.}

Petrus Scriverius, who, by and large, sought to balance the antiquarian and humanist tendencies in historical writing – on the one hand, making the medieval sources available in their entirety,\footnote{For Scriverius, see P. Tuynman, ‘Petrus Scriverius 12 January 1576-30 April 1660’, Quaerendo 7 (1977), pp. 5-45; Langereis, Geschiedenis, which also has a bibliography of printed works and manuscripts, pp. 335-8. Notes in his hand are found in several manuscripts with medieval chronicles from the Dutch Low Countries, e.g., The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 75 B 14 (‘Dutch Beke’), where he compares the Dutch text with the Latin version of the chronicle; Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 6 E 1 (cat. 1178) (‘Clerc’).} and, on the other, attempting to cleanse the historical tradition of its ‘vanities and trifles’\footnote{Kampinga, Opvattingen, p. 37; P. Scriverius, Beschrijvinghe van out Batavien (Arnhem, 1612), ‘Voorreden’, sig. ...6v: ‘stroowissen ende visevasen’.
} and to sort out the
exaggerated numbers referred to in medieval histories — salvaged a description in the ‘Chronicle of Gouda’ of an early Frisian king’s wife as a ‘giantess’, a reusinne, by remarking that she must have been ‘from Denmark or Russia, and for that reason called a Russa, or Russinne’. He still organized each of his works according to the succession of rulers, copying the practice of the medieval chronicles which he collected as sources for the history of Holland. In these ways, the medieval history of the county of Holland was glorified with the aim of providing a monument to the political prominence of the province of Holland in the Dutch Republic. Even for hard-line Protestant historians, miracles continued to pose a religious dilemma, for although they were regarded as Roman Catholic lies, they could not be rejected out of hand without denying the omnipotence of God. Only with Simon van Leeuwen, towards the later part of the seventeenth century, do we find complete and consistent rejection: such stories are ‘old spinsters’ gossip’, ‘false and inhuman marvels, all clad with a gleam of holiness’, ‘decorated rags and drivel markets’ by ‘ignorant monks’.

Two further strands of the medieval historical tradition of the Dutch Low Countries had an unexpected Nachleben in the works of historians of the early modern period, both humanist and antiquarian. The first of these is the fascination with Britain and its connection to the earliest history of the region, a recurring theme in late medieval historical writing about Holland, which continued to exert an influence. This is apparent not only from the extensive space which some historians allotted to debunking the giants’ story, but also from histories which, having jettisoned the medieval

1120 Kampinga, Opvattingen, pp. 38-9. The research of Scriverius was used by Gouthoeven to reject some of the myths of the Divisiekronek.
1122 See Langereis, Geschiedenis, pp. 255-64, for the concept of the gravenreeks (‘series of counts’) and its application in Scriverius’s works.
1123 Kampinga, Opvattingen, pp. 46-7.
1125 See above, Chapter 1, pp. 37, 57, 58, 68, 71; Chapter 2, p. 91; Chapter 3, pp. 193, 202.
1126 E.g., Junius, Batavia, pp. 9-13 (cap. 2): ‘De Gigantibus, quos fabulantur Annales Batauiam tenuisse’, which is a half-hearted attempt to dismiss the story, finally concluding that the giants were, in fact, oversized Northmen; Scriverius, Beschrijvinghe van oud Batavien, sig. *6r-v is unequivocal in rejecting it.
material about Britain, replaced it with new information, based on Tacitus’s reference in the *Historiae* to the Batavians’ exploits in the Roman conquest of *Britannia*.

Cornelius Aurelius referred to this story, providing later historians with the opportunity of continuing to discuss the history of Britain, even if that history was now located in the ancient, rather than the medieval, past. The ‘Brittenburg’ (Fortress Britain), one of the legendary fortresses of Holland mentioned in the medieval tradition, was also re-introduced into the Batavian story, an opportunity gratefully exploited by Hadrianus Junius. Pieter Corneliszoon Bockenberg, in typical fashion, attempted to reconcile the humanist with the medieval material: in addition to the Batavians, he also gave prominence – with reference to Bede – to the Anglo-Saxon invasion of Britain and the subsequent missions to the Continent. Hugo Grotius presented the *Batavorum insula* as the operating base for Julius Caesar’s conquest of Britain, making the history of Roman Britain start in Holland (a mirror image of Beke’s narrative, in which Holland’s history started in Britain):

Most of all in Britain, however, did the Batavian army support Roman interests, which experienced enormous pressure during this period; with their help, London was reconquered, and a man called Civilis made governor of Britain: that he was a Batavian of royal descent is, in my opinion, sufficiently indicated by his name, which is derived from that most renowned commander of the Flavian era.

He went on to stress the ancient cohabitation of the ‘Batavian’ North Sea coast by Britons, Angles and Frisians, mentioning the ‘Brittenburg’. Well into the eighteenth century, the links between Batavian and British history were maintained.

---


1129 Junius, *Batavia*, pp. 107-22 (cap. 10). Cf. the confused accounts about this fortress in the *Divisiekroniek*, fols 12r-v, 16r-v, 29v, 49v.


1132 Ibid., p. 76: ‘Maxime autem in Britannia laborantem circa haec tempora rem Romanam Batavorum arma fulcivere, quorum ope recuperatum Londinum, datusque rector Britanniae Civilis; quem Batavum regio sanguine fuisse, nomen ipsum, a nobilissimo Flavianorum temporum duce deductum, satis, ut puto, ostendit.’ Translation from the edition by Waszink et al.


1134 E.g., *Beschryving van het oude Batavische zeestrand* (The Hague, 1753).
Another strand of medieval historical thinking which survived in early modern historical writing was the idea of ‘freedom’. Although poorly defined and generally applicable exclusively to the polity of the county rather than to its people – and when to a people, such as the Frisians, often interpreted negatively –, this notion had, nevertheless, been of central importance to historians of Holland throughout the Middle Ages.\(^{1135}\) It was still used in a very similar way in the *Divisie kroniek*;\(^{1136}\) but it was altered and renegotiated in the later sixteenth century, again partly through the application of the Batavian story, to refer to supreme sovereignty over the region, without submission to an imperial power.\(^{1137}\) Yet, while in historical writing of the Dutch Republic the semi-monarchical leadership of the counts was dismissed, together with that of the emperor, the narrative was not transformed into an argument for sovereignty of the people: the ideal state was now considered to be, variously, either the aristocratic leadership of the States or the more autocratic government of the House of Nassau.\(^{1138}\)

The turn of the seventeenth century witnessed the emergence of the first *historiae* of the Dutch Low Countries written in a classical, mainly Tacitean and Livian, vein, and serving as an alternative form of narrative history. At the same time, differences of method and approach between humanist historians, on the one hand, and antiquarian historians, on the other, became increasingly apparent. Disagreement about the historiographical inheritance provoked an intense personal feud in this period, lasting more than a decade; the protagonists being Janus Dousa Sr,\(^{1139}\) representing the humanist approach to history, and Pieter Corneliszoon Bockenberg,\(^{1140}\) that of the antiquarians.\(^{1141}\) While Bockenberg’s

\(^{1135}\) See above, Chapter 1, pp. 36, 38, 47, 51, 58, 59, 67.

\(^{1136}\) But now as part of the Batavian story: see above, Chapter 3, p. 190.

\(^{1137}\) See Kampinga, *Opvattingen*, pp. 108-33, who says that the idea of the complete sovereignty of Holland was new in the late sixteenth century; he then traces certain antecedents in medieval sources, particularly the notion of independence from the Roman Empire. Grotius, *Antiquity*, p. 58, contrasts ‘liberty’ and ‘monarchy’. See also E. O. G. Haitma Mulier and W. R. E. Velema (eds), *Vrijheid: een geschiedenis van de vijftiende tot de twintigste eeuw* (Amsterdam, 1999).

\(^{1138}\) Kampinga, *Opvattingen*, pp. 158-70.


principal aim was to collect, analyse and present historical data,\textsuperscript{1142} for Dousa the true value of history lay in an aesthetic ideal, modelled on the writings of Tacitus and Livy.\textsuperscript{1143}

Dousa aimed to use ‘reliable’ sources exclusively, which entailed a distinct preference for works written at the same time as the events they described, with most later evidence dismissed, and favouring documentary sources over narrative ones. By contrast, Bockenberg, when contemporary and documentary sources were lacking, was prepared to accept ‘tradition’,\textsuperscript{1144} maintaining that what was traditionally accepted and did not go against experience should be reported, even if it seemed unreliable.\textsuperscript{1145} Bockenberg’s position was shared by Hadrianus Junius, who also argued that ‘ancestral traditions passing as if from hand to hand’ could be treated as legitimate sources.\textsuperscript{1146}

The feud between Bockenberg and Dousa attests to the vibrancy of the historical culture of the Dutch Republic in the early seventeenth century. Together, paradoxically, they were responsible for opening up the medieval history of the Dutch Low Countries as a field of academic inquiry. Their respective approaches to the study of the (medieval) past – the antiquarian’s almost indiscriminate collection and juxtaposition of the greatest possible quantity of historical source materials, on the one hand, and the humanist’s rhetorical presentation of material, based on selective sifting and aesthetic adjustment, on the other – remained in conflict and uneasy symbiosis throughout the seventeenth century. Progress in historical method, however, came from the antiquarian side. Yet the activities of antiquarians such as Petrus Scriverius and Marcus Zuierius Boxhorn,


\textsuperscript{1142} The antiquarian character of his historical works is evident from their titles: e.g., P. C. Bockenberg, Catalogus, genealogia, et brevis historia, regulorum Hollandiae, Zelandiae et Frisiae (Leiden, 1584); idem, Historia et genealogia Brederodiorum.

\textsuperscript{1143} See Kampinga, Opvattingen, pp. 25-6.

\textsuperscript{1144} Ibid., p. 31; Bockenberg, Prisci Bataviae et Frisiae reges, p. 96.

\textsuperscript{1145} Bockenberg, Historia et genealogia Brederodiorum, sigs A7v-A8r (‘Lectori’).

\textsuperscript{1146} Junius, Batavia, dedication to the States of Holland, sig. *4r-v: ‘traditionibus majorum quasi per manus transeuntibus’. See also Kampinga, Opvattingen, p. 32. Junius’s comment echoes the statement in the Decretum de Canoniciis Scripturis of the Council of Trent (Session IV, 8 April 1546) that the oral traditions of the Catholic Church were ‘quasi per manus traditae’.
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including the collection and publication of medieval chronicles, should be seen, at least in part, as a reaction to the narrowly literary character of humanist historical writing.\footnote{Kampinga, \textit{Opvattingen}, p. 41.}
Fig. 35: Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Ltk 841, fol. 29r: eighteenth-century manuscript copy of the ‘Dutch Beke’

Image taken with kind permission of the staff of the Rare Book Room at the Universiteitsbibliotheek, Leiden.
CONCLUSION: MEDIEVAL HISTORY AND THE DUTCH REPUBLIC

As we have seen in this chapter, interest in medieval history in the early modern period extended beyond a small coterie of scholars and historical enthusiasts. It was also shared by those who eagerly purchased almanacs and other popular products of the printing press in the Dutch Republic, giving a new lease of life to the medieval chronicle tradition of Holland. Moreover, historical episodes from the Middle Ages were also depicted, often for contemporary political ends, in the visual arts and on the stage.\textsuperscript{1148}

Additional evidence for the continuing influence of the medieval chronicle tradition of Holland is often found in unexpected places – even, on occasion, outside of Holland. The story of the countess of Hennenberg’s 365 children, which Jan told in great detail and Erasmus dismissed as a fable,\textsuperscript{1149} appears in texts throughout Europe,\textsuperscript{1150} including later editions, expanded by several different authors, of Pierre Boaistuau’s \textit{Histoires prodigieuses}, originally published in 1560.\textsuperscript{1151} Furthermore, a late sixteenth-century Dutch translation of this work contains a further continuation,\textsuperscript{1152} with a chapter ‘about giants and astonishingly strong people’,\textsuperscript{1153} in which the Dutch author, probably thinking about the giants of Albion,\textsuperscript{1154} writes: ‘it seems that the Hollanders have descended from

\textsuperscript{1148}The siege of Damietta, the justice of Count Willem III and the murder of Floris V were depicted in paintings; the latter two as well as the countess of Hennenberg were performed on stage; see H. van de Waal, \textit{Drie eeuwen vaderlandsche geschied-uitbeelding, 1500-1800. Een iconologische studie}, 2 vols (The Hague, 1952), I, pp. 244, 259-60, 267-80; II, p. 139, n. 3; P. C. Hooft, \textit{Geraerd van Velsen / Baeto of Oorsprong der Hollanderen}, ed. H. Duits (Amsterdam, 2005); J. van den Vondel, \textit{Gysbrecht van Aemstel}, ed. M. B. Smits-Veldt (Amsterdam, 1994); M. B. Smits-Veldt, \textit{Een baljuw in opspraak} (Muiderberg, 1983).

\textsuperscript{1149}See above, Chapter 2, pp. 126-129.


\textsuperscript{1151}Among them, François de Belleforest and Claude de Tesserant: P. Boaistuau et al., \textit{Histoires prodigieuses} (Antwerp, 1594), pp. 320 (II.7); it is not found in earlier editions, e.g., P. Boaistuau, \textit{Histoires prodigieuses} (Paris, 1576), pp. 142-4 (cap. 30). Medieval sources were not very commonly used by sixteenth-century writers on marvels, but ‘when they were used, they were treated in the same manner as other written sources’: S. Leskinen, ‘Reliable Knowledge of Exotic Marvels of Nature in Sixteenth-Century French and English Texts’, PhD diss., Warburg Institute, 2008, p. 82.

\textsuperscript{1152}P. Boaistuau, \textit{Het wonderlijcke schadt-boeck der historien, begrijpende vele seldsame, vreemde ende wonderbaerlijcke geschiedenissen bevonden inde natuur, ende hare cracht en werckingen, soo inden menschen als inde beesten, elementen, etc.} (Dordrecht, 1592).

\textsuperscript{1153}Ibid., IV, cap. 3: ‘Van grote reusen ende wonderlicke stercke menschen’.

\textsuperscript{1154}See above, Chapter 1, pp. 57-58.
huge men, since they are generally taller and larger people than the average in other countries.\textsuperscript{1155}

In spite of the new genres of historical writing which developed during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, medieval chronicles of Holland were not only used by humanist and antiquarian historians and by editors as sources, but also continued to be treated as historical accounts in their own right. Manuscript copies of these chronicles, even those which had already appeared in print, were produced throughout the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{1156} The ‘Chronicle of Gouda’, for example, was copied, both from manuscript exemplars and from printed copies, many times between the first incunable edition and the close of the sixteenth century (Fig. 6).\textsuperscript{1157} As late as the eighteenth century, handwritten copies of medieval chronicles were made, apparently for personal, rather than professional academic, use (Fig. 35).\textsuperscript{1158}

The \textit{Divisiekroniek} served, to some extent, as a conduit for this continuing tradition. Jan van Naaldwijk was far from the only sixteenth-century chronicler who relied on it for an account of the medieval history of Holland, and he would not be the last to put his thoughts about the work in writing. Many readers left notes in the margins of their copies of the \textit{Divisiekroniek}.\textsuperscript{1159} An early seventeenth-century manuscript in the provincial archive in Haarlem contains a series of excerpts from the ‘chronicle of Holland printed in Leiden by Jan Seversz., anno 1517’, consisting of information from more than 100

\textsuperscript{1155}Boaistuau, \textit{Het wonderlijcke schadt-boeck}, p. 6: ‘Gelijk oock wel schijnt dat de Hollande rs van groote mannen gecom en zijn dewijle sy meest alle hooger ende grooter lieden zijn dan de gemeene van ander landen.’

\textsuperscript{1156}In some cases for the purpose of preparing editions and antiquarian studies: e.g., The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 131 G 31, copied by C. Bockenberg; Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MSS 2 E 23-4 (cat. 771), copied by C. van Muiden, possibly for Bockenberg; see M. Gumbert-Hepp, J. P. Gumbert and J. Burgers (eds), \textit{Annalen van Egmond: de Annales Egmundenses en het Chronicon Egmundanum uitgegeven en vertaald} (Hilversum, 2007) pp. 360-63. See also Langereis, \textit{Geschiedenis}, pp. 168-9, for the significance of manuscript dissemination of historical works in this period.

\textsuperscript{1157}E.g., The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, MS 75 H 34, c. 1500, copied from the printed edition; The Hague, Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum, MS 10 E 10, c. 1540, copied from a manuscript exemplar; Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS H. G. 22 (cat. 1180), fols 1r-90v, copied 1483; Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Periz. Qu. 44 (1597 copy of the first edition, including its colophon on fol. 156r). For the exemplars of these manuscripts, see A. Janse, ‘De Historie van Hollant. Een nieuw begin in de Hollandse geschiedschrijving in de vijftiende eeuw’, \textit{Millennium. Tijdschrift voor middeleeuwse studies} 21 (2007), pp. 19-38, at 22.

\textsuperscript{1158}E.g., the copy of the ‘Dutch Beke’ in Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS Ltk 841. The role of manuscripts in literary culture in the early modern era is still largely uncharted territory; see, however, for England: H. Love, \textit{Scribal Publication in Seventeenth-Century England} (Oxford, 1993) and H. R. Woudhuysen, \textit{Sir Philip Sidney and the Circulation of Manuscripts 1558-1640} (Oxford, 1996). As Jan van Naaldwijk’s autographs show, however, manuscript production was not always aimed at \textit{publication} or \textit{circulation}.

\textsuperscript{1159}See Tilmans, \textit{Historiography}, pp. 235 and 303-4, n. 50; notes are found in both Latin and Dutch.
chapters of the *Divisiekroniek*, increasingly heavily edited towards the end. As well as selections from the *Divisiekroniek*, this manuscript, which was copied by two different hands, includes excerpts from several other printed works of historical interest, including the Latin chronicle of Holland of Johannes a Leydis and the *Nederlantsche antiquiteiten* of Richard Verstegan (Richard Rowlands), a Dutch adaptation of his *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*; both are polemical treatises in which medieval history is re-appropriated as a source of pride for contemporary Catholics. The manuscript concludes with several comments on the recent history of Holland by the main compiler, based on his own observations concerning events in his own day and on the testimony of reliable witnesses (‘memorabilia quaedam, quae vel meo contigerunt tempore vel a viris fide dignis collegi’). It is an idiosyncratic collection with a noticeable Catholic slant and deserves further investigation as evidence of the dissemination of historical data in the early decades of the Dutch Republic. Even more than Jan’s chronicle, this *florilegium*, gathered together out of interest rather than for the purposes of historical research, was a product of the age of printing: chapter and folio references from published works indicate the source of each piece of information. Although the central role of printed works in the diffusion of historical knowledge greatly increased throughout the century, instead of putting an end to the medieval historical tradition, it helped to keep medieval chronicles in circulation.

Dutch historians had a distinct preference for works covering short periods of their nation’s history, accounts of particular localities and thematic treatments of, for instance, political institutions, the Church, land reclamations or trading companies. It was not until 1749 that the first complete national narrative history of the Netherlands was published. No satisfactory explanation for the long absence of such a history has been

---

put forward; nevertheless, it is clear that a number of factors played a part. Significantly, sponsorship by individual States was much more common than by the States General and also appears to have born more fruit.1164 Certain subjects – the Reformation, the Dutch Revolt, the study of antiquities – were regarded as appropriate subjects for histories encompassing various regions of the Netherlands, which could be seen as forming a (temporary) unity within these contexts, though, even then, one province generally received the lion’s share of attention. No one thought of writing a national narrative history because regionalism remained the prevalent historical perspective.1165 Seen in this light, the Divisiekroniek was not, as has been claimed, the work in which, for the first time, ‘a collective, historical identity was formulated which was valid for the Dutch natie, or people, as a whole’.1166 On the contrary, it was the existence of large regional histories such as the Divisiekroniek which made ‘national’, that is, supra-regional, ones unnecessary.1167 This also helps to explain why the medieval historical tradition did not disappear: it was uniquely suited to meet the demands of a regional and factionalized readership who put province before country, even if they wanted events in their province to be placed within the larger context of regional and world history.


1164 An example of unsuccessful sponsorship by the States General is the case of Paulus Merula; see Haitsma Mulier, Repertorium, pp. 283-4 (no. 332). Bor is the exception who proves the rule, but his commission by the States General in 1616 was more a response to the success of his activities than a cause of it. See ibid., pp. 59-60 (no. 75).

1165 See also S. Groenveld, ‘“Natie” en “patria” bij zestiende-eeuwse Nederlanders’, in N. C. F. van Sas (ed.), Vaderland (Amsterdam, 1999), pp. 55-81.


1167 For readers in the southern Low Countries, the role of the Divisiekroniek – a large history of the Dutch Low Countries, consisting of a collection of regional histories placed within a universal historical framework and serving as a compilation of the late medieval chronicle tradition – appears to have been played by Marcus van Vaernewijck’s Spieghel der Nederlandscher audtheyt (Ghent, 1568); reprinted, under its better-known title, Die historie van Belgis, in 1574, 1619, 1619, 1619, 1665, 1784, 1829.
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[ . . . . ]erst den ghenen daer jc wt ouergheset hebbe wt [ . . . . ] ende latijnen in duijts

1)* [ . . . . ]uen van julius cesar
2)* [ . . . . ] int leuen van julius cesar
3)* [ . . . . ] int leuen van julius cesar
4)* [ . . . . ]onius jnt boeck van den xij keijseren
5)* [ . . . . ]ustinus de ciuitate dei van julius cesar
6)* [ . . . . ]rtholomeus de proprietatibus rerum
7) [. . . . ]neas siluius in sijn cosmographia
8) Die gesten ende historijen van roman
9)* Vincencius in sijn spieghel historiael
10) Anthoninus in sijn cronijcken
11) Pogius in sijn epistelen
12) Blondus in sijn decades ende cronijck
13) Bergomensis in sijn supplement ende cronijck
14)* Virgilius in sijn eneijdos
15) Robbertus gagwinus in sijn cronijck van die coninghen van vrancrijck
16) Die wanderinghe van Johannes de hese priester
17) Die grote cronijck met die figuren

§ ‘[List] of the authors which I [have used for the] present chronicle [in French, Latin] and Dutch. [Listing] first those from whom I’ve translated out of [French] and Latin into Dutch.’

1168 Unidentified ‘Life of Julius Caesar’.
1169 Unidentified ‘Life of Julius Caesar’.
1170 Unidentified ‘Life of Julius Caesar’.
1171 Suetonius, De vita Caesarum.
1172 Augustine, De civitate dei.
1173 Bartholomaeus Anglicus, De proprietatibus rerum.
1174 Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, Cosmographia.
1175 Gesta Romanorum.
1176 Vincent of Beauvais, Speculum historiale.
1177 Antoninus Florentinus, Chronicon.
1178 Flavio Biondo, Historiarum ab inclinatione Romanorum imperii decades.
1179 Poggio Bracciolini, Epistolae.
1180 Jacobus Philippus Foresti Bergomensis, Supplementum supplementi chronicarum.
1181 Vergil, Aeneid.
1182 Robert Gaguin, Compendium de origine et gestis Francorum.
1183 Johannes de Hesse, Itinerarium per diversas mundi partes.
1184 Hartmann Schedel, Liber cronicarum.
18) Johannes sijmoneta int leuen van franciscus phorcia hartoeh van milanen
19) Wilhemus van der goude int oerloch van onse landen ende den ghelres
20) Bergomensis in sijn boeck de preclaris mulieribus
21)* Titus liuius in sijn decades
22)* Juuenalis in sijn satijris
23) Defensorium virginis inhoudende sommighe miraculen
24) Fasciculus temporum

Item die namen der gheenre daer je wt ouergedes hebbe wt den walschen an duijtschs

25) Pogius in sijn facecijen
26) Heer jan froessaert in sijn cronijck
27) Meester jan mejier van belges in sijn bescriuinghe van den venechianen ende van den sophij
28) Meester marciael int leuen van coninck kaerl die vij
29) int leuen van johan tristan

Hijer na volghen die duijtsche autoeren

30) Johannes van der beke sijn cr van den biscoppen van vtrecht
31) Sommighe gheprente cronijcken
32) Wt die wanderinghe van heer marcus
33) Wt noch andere ghedichten ende priuilegijen
34) Wt die cronijck van der grauinnen van henne
35) Wt een boeck ghemaect van heren barnhart van bre
36) Wt die excellente cronijck van brabant

 Explicit